arXiv:1701.01741v1 [stat.ME] 6 Jan 2017

Testing for stationarity of functional time series in the frequency domain*

Alexander Aue† Anne van Delft‡

January 10, 2017

Abstract

Interest in functional time series has spiked in the recent past with papers covering both methodology and applications being published at a much increased pace. This article contributes to the research in this area by proposing stationarity tests for functional time series based on frequency domain methods. Setting up the tests requires a delicate understanding of periodogram- and spectral density operators that are the functional counterparts of periodogram- and spectral density matrices in the multivariate world. Properties of the proposed statistics are derived both under the null hypothesis of stationary functional time series and under the smooth alternative of locally stationary functional time series. The methodology is theoretically justified through asymptotic results. Evidence from simulation studies and an application to annual temperature curves suggests that the tests work well in finite samples.

Keywords: Frequency domain methods, Functional data analysis, Locally stationary processes, Spectral analysis

MSC 2010: Primary: 62G99, 62H99, Secondary: 62M10, 62M15, 91B84

1 Introduction

The aim of this paper is to provide new stationarity tests for functional time series based on frequency domain methods. Particular attention is given to taking into account alternatives allowing for smooth variation as a source of non-stationarity, even though non-smooth alternative can be covered as well. Functional data analysis has seen an upsurge in research contributions for at least one decade. This is reflected in the growing number of monographs in the area. Readers interested in the current state of statistical inference procedures may consult Bosq (2000), Ferraty & Vieu (2010), Horváth & Kokoszka (2012), Hsing & Eubank (2015) and Ramsay & Silverman (2010).

*This research was partially supported by NSF grants DMS 1305858 and DMS 1407530

†Department of Statistics, University of California, Davis, CA 95616, USA, email: aaue@ucdavis.edu

‡Insitute of Statistics, Biostatistics and Actuarial Sciences, Université catholique de Louvain, Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium, email: anne.vandelft@uclouvain.be

Papers on functional time series have come into the focus more recently and constitute now an active area of research. Hörmann & Kokoszka (2010) introduced a general weak dependence concept for stationary functional time series, while van Delft & Eichler (2016) provided a framework for locally stationary functional time series. Antoniadis & Sapatinas (2003), Aue et al. (2015) and Besse et al. (2000) constructed prediction methodology that may find application across many areas of science, economics and finance. With the exception of van Delft & Eichler (2016), the above contributions are concerned with procedures in the time domain. Complementing methodology in the frequency domain has been developed in parallel. One should mention Panaretos & Tavakoli (2013), who provided results concerning the Fourier analysis of time series in function spaces, and Hörmann et al. (2015), who addressed the problem of dimension reduction for functional time series using dynamic principal components.

The methodology proposed in this paper provides a new frequency domain inference procedure for functional time series. More precisely, tests for second-order stationarity are developed. In the univariate case, such tests have a long history, going back at least to the seminal paper Priestley & Subba Rao (1969), who based their method on the evaluation of evolutionary spectra of a given time series. Other contributions building on this work include von Sachs & Neumann (2000), who used local periodograms and wavelet analysis, and Paparoditis (2009), whose test is based on comparing a local estimate of the spectral density to a global estimate. In all three papers, interest is in smoothly varying alternatives. The same tests, however, also have power against non-smooth alternatives such as structural breaks or change-points. A recent review discussing methodology for structural breaks in time series is Aue & Horváth (2013).

The proposed test for second-order stationarity of functional time series uses the Discrete Fourier Transform (DFT). Its construction seeks to exploit that the DFTs of a functional time series evaluated at distinct Fourier frequencies are asymptotically uncorrelated if and only if the series is second-order stationary. The proposed method is therefore related to the work of Dwivedi & Subba Rao (2016), who put forth similar tests in a univariate framework. A different version of stationarity tests, based on time domain methodology involving cumulative sum statistics (Aue & Horváth, 2013), is given in Horváth et al. (2014).

The introduced tests are the first of their kind in the frequency domain analysis of functional time series. A delicate understanding of the functional DFT is needed in order to derive the asymptotic theory given here. In particular, results on the large-sample behavior of a quadratic form test statistic are provided both under the null hypothesis of a stationary functional time series and the alternative of a locally stationary functional time series. For this, a weak convergence result is established that might be of interest in its own right as it is verified using a simplified tightness criterion going back to work of Cremers & Kadelka (1986) that was first applied in the functional time series setting in van Delft & Eichler (2016).

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 provides the background, gives the req-

uisite notations and introduces the functional version of the DFT. The exact form of the hypothesis test, model assumptions and the test statistics are introduced in Section 3. The large-sample behavior under the null hypothesis of second-order stationarity and the alternative of local stationarity is established in Sections 4. Empirical aspects are highlighted in Section 5. Finally, technical details are relegated to the Appendix and several auxiliary results are proved in the supplementary document Aue & van Delft (2016), henceforth referred to simply as the Online Supplement.

2 Notation and setup

2.1 The function space

A functional time series $(X_t\colon t \in \mathbb{Z})$ will be viewed in this paper as a sequence of random elements on a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, P)$ taking values in the separable Hilbert space of real-valued, square integrable functions on the unit interval $[0,1]$. This Hilbert space will be denoted by $H_{\mathbb{R}} = L^2([0,1],\mathbb{R})$. The functional DFT of $(X_t\colon t \in \mathbb{Z})$, to be introduced in Section 2.3, can then be viewed as an element of $H_{\mathbb{C}} = L^2([0,1],\mathbb{C})$, the complex counterpart of $H_{\mathbb{R}}$. While the interval $[0,1]$ provides a convenient parametrization of the functions, the results of this paper continue to hold for any separable Hilbert space.

The complex conjugate of $z \in \mathbb{C}$ is denoted by $\overline{z}$ and the imaginary number by i. The inner product and the induced norm on $H_{\mathbb{C}}$ are given by

$$\langle f, g\rangle = \int_0^1 f(\tau)\overline{g(\tau)}d\tau \qquad \text{and} \qquad \|f\|_2 = \sqrt{\langle f, f\rangle}, \tag{2.1}$$

respectively, for $f, g \in H_{\mathbb{C}}$. Two elements of $H_{\mathbb{C}}$ are tacitly understood to be equal if their difference has vanishing L_2-norm. More generally, for functions $g\colon [0,1]^k \to \mathbb{C}$, the supremum norm is denoted by

$$\|g\|_\infty = \sup_{\tau_1,\ldots,\tau_k\in[0,1]} |g(\tau_1,\ldots,\tau_k)|$$

and the L^p-norm by

$$\|g\|_p = \left(\int_{[0,1]^k} |g(\tau_1,\ldots,\tau_k)|^p \, d\tau_1\cdots d\tau_k\right)^{1/p}.$$

In all of the above, the obvious modifications apply to $H_{\mathbb{R}}$, the canonical Hilbert space in the functional data analysis setting.

Let H stand for either $H_{\mathbb{R}}$ or $H_{\mathbb{C}}$. An operator A on H is said to be compact if its pre-image is compact. A compact operator admits a *singular value decomposition*

$$A = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} s_n(A)\, \psi_n \otimes \phi_n, \tag{2.2}$$

where $(s_n(A)\colon n \in \mathbb{N})$, are the *singular values* of A, $(\phi_n\colon n \in \mathbb{N})$ and $(\psi_n\colon n \in \mathbb{N})$ orthonormal bases of H and $\otimes$ denoting the tensor product. The singular values are ordered to form a monotonically decreasing

sequence of non-negative numbers. Based on the convergence rate to zero, operators on H can be classified into particular *Schatten p-classes*. That is, for $p \geqslant 1$, the *Schatten p-class* $S_p(H)$ is the subspace of all compact operators A on H such that the sequence $s(A) = (s_n(A) \colon n \in \mathbb{N})$ of singular values of A belongs to the sequence space ℓ^p, that is,

$$A \in S_p(H) \qquad \text{if and only if} \qquad |||A|||_p = \Big(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} s_n^p(A) \Big)^{1/p} < \infty,$$

where $|||A|||_p$ is referred to as the *Schatten p-norm*. The space $S_p(H)$ together with the norm $|||A|||_p$ forms a Banach space and a Hilbert space in case $p = 2$. By convention, the space $S_\infty(H)$ indicates the space of bounded linear operators equipped with the standard operator norm. For $1 \leqslant p \leqslant q$, the inclusion $S_p(H) \subseteq S_q(H)$ is valid. Two important classes are the Trace-class (nuclear) and the Hilbert–Schmidt operators on H, which are given by $S_1(H)$ and $S_2(H)$, respectively. More properties of Schatten-class operators, in particular of Hilbert–Schmidt operators, are provided in van Delft & Eichler (2016). Finally, the identity operator is denoted by I_H and the zero operator by O_H.

2.2 Dependence structure on the function space

A functional time series $X = (X_t \colon t \in \mathbb{Z})$ is called strictly stationary if, for all finite sets of indices $J \subset \mathbb{Z}$, the joint distribution of $(X_{t+j} \colon j \in J)$ does not depend on $t \in \mathbb{Z}$. Similarly, X is weakly stationary if its first- and second-order moments exist and are invariant under translation in time. The L^2-setup provides a point-wise interpretation to these moments; that is, the mean function m of X can be defined using the parametrization $m(\tau) = \mathbb{E}[X_t(\tau)]$, $\tau \in [0,1]$, and the autocovariance kernel c_h at lag $h \in \mathbb{Z}$ by

$$c_h(\tau, \tau') = \operatorname{Cov}(X_{t+h}(\tau), X_t(\tau')), \qquad \tau, \tau' \in [0,1]. \tag{2.3}$$

Both m and c_h are well defined in the L^2-sense if $\mathbb{E}[\|X_0\|_2^2] < \infty$. Each kernel c_h induces a corresponding *autocovariance operator* $\mathcal{C}_h$ on $H_\mathbb{R}$ by

$$\mathcal{C}_h\, g(\tau) = \int_0^1 c_h(\tau, \tau')\, g(\tau')\, d\tau' = \mathbb{E}\big[\langle g, X_0 \rangle\, X_h(\tau)\big], \tag{2.4}$$

for all $g \in H_\mathbb{R}$. In analogy to weakly stationary multivariate time series, where the covariance matrix and spectral density matrix form a Fourier pair, the *spectral density operator* $\mathcal{F}_\omega$ is given by the Fourier transform of $\mathcal{C}_h$,

$$\mathcal{F}_\omega = \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{h \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{C}_h\, e^{-\mathrm{i}\omega h}. \tag{2.5}$$

A sufficient condition for the existence of $\mathcal{F}_\omega$ in $S_p(H_\mathbb{C})$ is $\sum_{h \in \mathbb{Z}} |||\mathcal{C}_h|||_p < \infty$.

In this paper, no structural modeling conditions, for example along the lines of the weak dependence notion in Hörmann & Kokoszka (2010) are imposed. Rather, as in Panaretos & Tavakoli (2013), higher-order

dependence among the functional observations is defined through cumulant mixing conditions (Brillinger, 1981; Brillinger & Rosenblatt, 1967). For this, the notion of higher-order cumulant tensors is required; see Appendix S1 for a discussion on their properties. Point-wise, the k-th order cumulant function of the process X can be defined by

$$c_{t_1,\ldots,t_{k-1}}(\tau_1,\ldots,\tau_k) = \sum_{\nu=(\nu_1,\ldots,\nu_p)} (-1)^{p-1}\,(p-1)! \prod_{l=1}^{p} \mathbb{E}\Bigg[\prod_{j\in\nu_l} X_{t_j}(\tau_j)\Bigg], \tag{2.6}$$

where the summation is over all unordered partitions of $\{1,\ldots,k\}$. The quantity in (2.6) will be referred to as the *k-th order cumulant kernel* if it is properly defined in the L^2-sense. A sufficient condition for this to be satisfied is $\mathbb{E}[\|X_0\|_2^k] < \infty$. The cumulant kernel $c_{t_1,\ldots,t_{2k-1}}(\tau_1,\ldots,\tau_{2k})$ induces a *2k-th order cumulant operator* $\mathcal{C}_{t_1,\ldots,t_{2k-1}}$ through right integration:

$$\mathcal{C}_{t_1,\ldots,t_{2k-1}} g(\tau_1,..,\tau_k) = \int_{[0,1]^k} c_{t_1,\ldots,t_{2k-1}}(\tau_1,\ldots,\tau_{2k}) g(\tau_{k+1},\ldots,\tau_{2k})\, d\tau_{k+1}\cdots d\tau_{2k},$$

which maps from $L^2([0,1]^k,\mathbb{R})$ to $L^2([0,1]^k,\mathbb{R})$. Similar to the case $k=2$, this operator will form a Fourier pair with a $2k$-th order cumulant spectral operator given summability with respect to $|||\cdot|||_p$ is satisfied. The $2k$-th order cumulant spectral operator is specified as

$$\mathcal{F}_{\omega_1,\ldots,\omega_{2k-1}} = (2\pi)^{1-2k} \sum_{t_1,\ldots,t_{2k-1}\in\mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{C}_{t_1,\ldots,t_{2k-1}} \exp\Bigg(-\mathrm{i}\sum_{j=1}^{2k-1}\omega_j\, t_j\Bigg), \tag{2.7}$$

where the convergence is in $|||\cdot|||_p$. Under suitable regularity conditions, the corresponding kernels also form a Fourier pair.

2.3 The functional discrete Fourier transform

Let $(X_t : t\in\mathbb{Z})$ be a zero-mean, $H_{\mathbb{R}}$-valued stochastic process of which the stretch $X_0,\ldots,X_{T-1}$ is observed. In a similar way as one defines the DFT for univariate time series, the *functional Discrete Fourier Transform* (fDFT) $D_\omega^{(T)}$ at frequency ω is set up point-wise by letting

$$D_\omega^{(T)}(\tau) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi T}} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} X_t(\tau) e^{-\mathrm{i}\omega t}, \qquad \tau\in[0,1]. \tag{2.8}$$

If $\mathbb{E}[\|X\|_2^2] < \infty$, the *periodogram operator* at frequency ω is defined as the tensor product on $H_{\mathbb{C}}$ of $D_\omega^{(T)}$ in (2.8) with its adjoint $[D_\omega^{(T)}]^\dagger$, that is,

$$I_\omega^{(T)} = [D_\omega^{(T)}] \otimes [D_\omega^{(T)}]^\dagger.$$

Panaretos & Tavakoli (2013) gave a generalization of Theorem 4.4.1 in Brillinger (1981) on periodogram matrices to the operator setting. Their Theorem 2.2 is the starting point for the considerations of this paper. It

states that, under weak dependence conditions expressed through higher-order cumulants, the fDFTs evaluated at distinct frequencies yield asymptotically independent Gaussian random elements in $H_{\mathbb{C}}$. It shows therefore that the fDFT sequence of a Hilbert space stationary process is asymptotically uncorrelated at the canonical frequencies $\omega_j = 2\pi j/T$. This fundamental result will be extended to locally stationary functional time series in this paper. In particular, a representation of the cumulant kernel of the fDFT sequence in terms of the (time-varying) spectral density kernel is given. For weakly stationary processes, it will turn out in particular that, for $j \neq j'$ or $j \neq T - j'$, the covariance of the fDFT satisfies $\mathrm{Cov}(D^{(T)}_{\omega_j}, D^{(T)}_{\omega_{j'}}) = O(1/T)$. The reverse argument (uncorrelatedness of the functional DFT sequence implies weak stationarity) can be shown by means of the inverse fDFT

$$X_t(\tau) = \sqrt{\frac{2\pi}{T}} \sum_{j=0}^{T-1} D^{(T)}_{\omega_j}(\tau) e^{\mathrm{i}\omega_j t}, \qquad \tau \in [0,1]. \tag{2.9}$$

Using this expression, the point-wise covariance kernel of X_t and $X_{t'}$ in terms of the fDFT sequence can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} c_{t,t'}(\tau,\tau') &= \mathbb{E}[X_t(\tau) X_{t'}(\tau')] \\ &= \frac{2\pi}{T} \sum_{j,j'=0}^{T-1} \mathbb{E}[D^{(T)}_{\omega_j}(\tau), \overline{D^{(T)}_{\omega_{j'}}(\tau')}] e^{\mathrm{i}t\omega_j - \mathrm{i}t'\omega_{j'}} \\ &= \frac{2\pi}{T} \sum_{j=0}^{T-1} \mathbb{E}[I^{(T)}_{\omega_j}(\tau,\tau')] e^{\mathrm{i}\omega_j(t-t')} \qquad (2.10) \\ &= c_{t-t'}(\tau,\tau'), \end{aligned}$$

where the equality in (2.10) holds in an L^2-sense when $\mathbb{E}[D^{(T)}_{\omega_j}(\tau)\overline{D^{(T)}_{\omega_{j'}}(\tau')}] = 0$ with $j \neq j'$ or $j \neq T - j'$. This demonstrates that the autocovariance kernel of a second-order stationary functional time series is obtained and, hence, that an uncorrelated DFT sequence implies second-order stationarity up to lag T. Below, the behavior of the fDFT under the smooth alternative of locally stationary functional time series is derived. Our findings thus extend the results of Dwivedi & Subba Rao (2016) to the functional time series setting.

3 The functional stationarity testing framework

This section gives precise formulations of the hypotheses of interest, states the main assumptions of the paper and introduces the test statistics. Throughout, interest is in testing the null hypothesis

$$H_0 \colon (X_t \colon t \in \mathbb{Z}) \text{ is a stationary functional time series}$$

versus the alternative

$$H_A \colon (X_t \colon t \in \mathbb{Z}) \text{ is a locally stationary functional time series.}$$

The definition of locally stationary functional time series is taken from van Delft & Eichler (2016).

Definition 3.1. *A stochastic process $(X_t\colon t \in \mathbb{Z})$ taking values in $H_{\mathbb{R}}$ is said to be locally stationary if*

(1) $X_t = X_t^{(T)}$ for $t = 1, \dots, T$ and $T \in \mathbb{N}$; and

(2) for any rescaled time $u \in [0,1]$, there is a strictly stationary process $(X_t^{(u)}\colon t \in \mathbb{Z})$ such that

$$\big\|X_t^{(T)} - X_t^{(u)}\big\|_2 \leqslant \Big(\Big|\tfrac{t}{T} - u\Big| + \tfrac{1}{T}\Big) P_{t,T}^{(u)} \qquad a.s.,$$

where $P_{t,T}^{(u)}$ is a positive, real-valued triangular array of random variables such that, for some $\rho > 0$ and $C < \infty$, $\mathbb{E}[|P_{t,T}^{(u)}|^\rho] < \infty$ for all t and T, uniformly in $u \in [0,1]$.

Note that, under H_A, the process constitutes a triangular array of functions. Inference methods are then based on in-fill asymptotics as popularized in Dahlhaus (1997) for univariate time series. The process is therefore observed on a finer grid as T increases and more observations are available at a local level. A rigorous statistical framework for locally stationary functional time series was recently provided in van Delft & Eichler (2016). These authors established in particular that linear functional time series can be defined by means of a functional time-varying Cramér representation and provided sufficient conditions in the frequency domain for the above definition to be satisfied.

Based on the observations in Section 2.3, a test for weak stationarity can be set up exploiting the uncorrelatedness of the elements in the sequence $(D_{\omega_j}^{(T)})$. Standardizing these quantities is a non-trivial task as the spectral density operators $\mathcal{F}_{\omega_j}^{(T)}$ are not only unknown but generally not globally invertible. Here, a statistic based on projections is considered. Let $(\psi_l\colon l \in \mathbb{N})$ be an orthonormal basis of $H_{\mathbb{C}}$. Then, $(\psi_l \otimes \psi_{l'}\colon l, l' \in \mathbb{N})$ is an orthonormal basis of $L^2([0,1]^2, \mathbb{C})$ and, by definition of the Hilbert–Schmidt inner product on the algebraic tensor product space $H \otimes_{\text{alg}} H$,

$$\langle \mathbb{E}\big(D_{\omega_{j_1}}^{(T)} \otimes D_{\omega_{j_2}}^{(T)}\big), \psi_l \otimes \psi_{l'} \rangle_{H\otimes H} = \mathbb{E}[\langle D_{\omega_{j_1}}^{(T)}, \psi_l\rangle \overline{\langle D_{\omega_{j_2}}^{(T)}, \psi_{l'}\rangle}] = \operatorname{Cov}\big(\langle D_{\omega_{j_1}}^{(T)}, \psi_l\rangle, \overline{\langle D_{\omega_{j_2}}^{(T)}, \psi_{l'}\rangle}\big).$$

This motivates to set up test statistics based on the quantities

$$\gamma_h^{(T)}(l,l') = \frac{1}{T}\sum_{j=1}^{T} \frac{\langle D_{\omega_j}^{(T)}, \psi_l\rangle \overline{\langle D_{\omega_{j+h}}^{(T)}, \psi_{l'}\rangle}}{\sqrt{\langle \mathcal{F}_{\omega_j}(\psi_l), \psi_l\rangle \overline{\langle \mathcal{F}_{\omega_{j+h}}^{\dagger}(\psi_{l'}), \psi_{l'}\rangle}}}, \qquad h = 1, \dots, T-1. \tag{3.1}$$

In practice, the unknown spectral density operators $\mathcal{F}_{\omega_j}$ and $\mathcal{F}_{\omega_{j+h}}$ are to be replaced with consistent estimators $\hat{\mathcal{F}}_{\omega_j}^{(T)}$ and $\hat{\mathcal{F}}_{\omega_{j+h}}^{(T)}$. The corresponding estimated quantity will be denoted by $\hat{\gamma}_h^{(T)}$. As an estimator of $\mathcal{F}_{\omega}^{(T)}$, take

$$\hat{\mathcal{F}}_{\omega}^{(T)} = \frac{2\pi}{T}\sum_{j=1}^{T} K_b(\omega - \omega_j)\big([D_{\omega_j}^T] \otimes [D_{\omega_j}^T]^\dagger\big), \tag{3.2}$$

where $K_b(\cdot) = \frac{1}{b}K(\frac{\cdot}{b})$ is a window function satisfying the following conditions.

Assumption 3.1. Let $K\colon [-\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2}] \to \mathbb{R}$ be a positive, symmetric window function with $\int K(x)dx = 1$ and $\int K(x)^2 dx < \infty$ that is periodically extended, i.e., $K_b(x) = \frac{1}{b}K(\frac{x\pm 2\pi}{b})$.

The periodic extension is to include estimates for frequencies around $\pm\pi$. Further conditions on the bandwidth b are imposed below to determine the large-sample behavior of $\hat{\gamma}_h^{(T)}$ under both the null and the alternative; see Section 4 below for details. The replacement of the unknown operators with consistent estimators requires to derive the order of the difference

$$\sqrt{T}\big|\gamma_h^{(T)} - \hat{\gamma}_h^{(T)}\big|. \tag{3.3}$$

It will be shown in the next section that, for appropriate choices of the bandwidth b, this term is negligible under both null and alternative hypothesis.

To set up the test statistic, it now appears reasonable to extract information across a range of directions $l, l' = 1, \ldots, L$ and a selection of lags $h = 1, \ldots, \bar{h}$, where $\bar{h}$ denotes an upper limit. Build therefore first the $L \times L$ matrix $\hat{\Gamma}_h^{(T)} = (\hat{\gamma}_h^{(T)}(l,l')\colon l,l' = 1,\ldots,L)$ and construct the vector

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_h^{(T)} = \mathrm{vec}(\hat{\Gamma}_h^{(T)})$$

by vectorizing $\hat{\Gamma}_h^{(T)}$ via stacking of its columns. Define

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_h^{(T)} = \boldsymbol{e}^\top \hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_h^{(T)}, \tag{3.4}$$

where $\boldsymbol{e}$ is a vector of dimension L^2 whose elements are all equal to one and $^\top$ denotes transposition. Choose now a collection $h_1, \ldots, h_M$ of lags each of which is upper bounded by $\bar{h}$ to pool information across a number of autocovariances and build the (scaled) vectors

$$\sqrt{T}\hat{\boldsymbol{b}}_M^{(T)} = \sqrt{T}\big(\Re\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{h_1}^{(T)}, \ldots, \Im\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{h_M}^{(T)}, \Im\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{h_1}^{(T)}, \ldots, \Im\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{h_M}^{(T)}\big)^\top,$$

where $\Re$ and $\Im$ denote real and imaginary part, respectively. Finally, set up the quadratic form

$$\hat{Q}_M^{(T)} = T(\hat{\boldsymbol{b}}_M^{(T)})^\top \hat{\Sigma}_M^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{b}}_M^{(T)}, \tag{3.5}$$

where $\hat{\Sigma}_M$ is an estimator of the asymptotic covariance matrix of the vectors $\boldsymbol{b}_M^{(T)}$ which are defined by replacing $\hat{\gamma}_h^{(T)}$ with $\gamma_h^{(T)}$ in the definition of $\hat{\boldsymbol{b}}_M^{(T)}$. The statistic $\hat{Q}_M^{(T)}$ will be used to test the null of stationarity against the alternative of local stationarity. Note that this quadratic form depends on the tuning parameters L and M.

4 Large-sample results

4.1 Properties under the null of stationarity

The following gives the main requirements under stationarity of the functional time series that are needed to establish the asymptotic behavior of the test statistics under the null hypothesis.

Assumption 4.1 (Stationary functional time series). *Let $(X_t : t \in \mathbb{Z})$ be a stationary functional time series with values in $H_{\mathbb{R}}$ such that*

(i) $\mathbb{E}[\|X_0\|_2^k] < \infty$,

(ii) $\sum_{t_1,\ldots,t_{k-1}=-\infty}^{\infty}(1+|t_j|^\ell)\|c_{t_1,\ldots,t_{k-1}}\|_2 < \infty$ *for all* $1 \leqslant j \leqslant k-1$,

for some fixed values of $k, \ell \in \mathbb{N}$.

The conditions of Assumption 4.1 ensure that the k-th order cumulant spectral density kernel

$$f_{\omega_1,\ldots,\omega_{k-1}}(\tau_1,\ldots,\tau_k) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{k-1}} \sum_{t_1,\ldots,t_{k-1}=-\infty}^{\infty} c_{t_1,\ldots,t_{k-1}}(\tau_1,\ldots,\tau_k) e^{-\mathrm{i}(\sum_{j=1}^k \omega_j t_j)} \tag{4.1}$$

is well-defined in L^2 and is uniformly continuous in ω with respect to $\|\cdot\|_2$. Additionally, the parameter ℓ controls the smoothness of f_ω in the sense that, for all $i \leqslant \ell$,

$$\sup_{\omega} \Big\| \frac{\partial^i}{\partial \omega^i} f_\omega \Big\|_2 < \infty. \tag{4.2}$$

A proof of these facts can be found in Panaretos & Tavakoli (2013); van Delft & Eichler (2016).Through right-integration, the function (4.1) induces a k-th order cumulant spectral density operator $\mathcal{F}_{\omega_1,\ldots,\omega_{k-1}}$ which is Hilbert–Schmidt. The following theorem establishes that the scaled difference between $\gamma_h^{(T)}$ and $\hat{\gamma}_h^{(T)}$ is negligible in large samples.

Theorem 4.1. *Let Assumptions 3.1 and 4.1 be satisfied with $k = 8$ and $\ell = 2$ and assume further that $\inf_\omega \langle \mathcal{F}(\psi), \psi \rangle > 0$ for all $\psi \in H$. Then, for any fixed h,*

$$\sqrt{T}|\gamma_h^{(T)} - \hat{\gamma}_h^{(T)}| = O_p\bigg(\frac{1}{\sqrt{bT}} + b^2\bigg) \qquad (T \to \infty).$$

The proof is given in Section S2 of the Online Supplement. Theorem 4.1 shows that the distributional properties of $\hat{\gamma}_h^{(T)}$ are asymptotically the same as those of $\gamma_h^{(T)}$, provided that the following extra condition on the bandwidth holds.

Assumption 4.2. *The bandwidth b satisfies $b \to 0$ such that $bT \to \infty$ as $T \to \infty$.*

Note that these rates are in fact necessary for the estimator in (3.2) to be consistent, see Panaretos & Tavakoli (2013), and therefore do not impose an additional constraint under H_0. The next theorem derives the second-order structure of $\gamma_h^{(T)}$. It shows that the asymptotic variance is uncorrelated for all lags h and that there is no correlation between the real and imaginary parts.

Theorem 4.2. *Let Assumption 4.1 be satisfied with $k = \{2, 4\}$. Then,*

$$T \operatorname{Cov}\Big(\Re\gamma_{h_1}^{(T)}(l_1, l_1'), \Re\gamma_{h_2}^{(T)}(l_2, l_2')\Big)$$

$$= T\,\mathrm{Cov}\Big(\Im\gamma_{h_1}^{(T)}(l_1,l_1'),\Im\gamma_{h_2}^{(T)}(l_2,l_2')\Big)$$

$$= \begin{cases} \dfrac{1}{4\pi}\Bigg(\displaystyle\int \frac{\mathcal{F}_{\omega}^{(l_1,l_2)}\mathcal{F}_{-\omega-\omega_h}^{(l_1',l_2')}}{\sqrt{\mathcal{F}_{\omega}^{(l_1,l_1)}\mathcal{F}_{-\omega}^{(l_2,l_2)}\mathcal{F}_{-\omega-\omega_h}^{(l_1',l_1')}\mathcal{F}_{\omega+\omega_h}^{(l_2',l_2')}}}d\omega + \int \frac{\mathcal{F}_{\omega}^{(l_1,l_2')}\mathcal{F}_{-\omega-\omega_h}^{(l_1',l_2)}}{\sqrt{\mathcal{F}_{\omega}^{(l_1,l_1)}\mathcal{F}_{-\omega}^{(l_2',l_2')}\mathcal{F}_{-\omega-\omega_h}^{(l_1',l_1')}\mathcal{F}_{\omega+\omega_h}^{(l_2,l_2)}}}d\omega \\ \qquad + \displaystyle\int\int \frac{\mathcal{F}_{\omega,-\omega-\omega_h,-\omega'}^{(l_1\,l_1',l_2\,l_2')}}{\sqrt{\mathcal{F}_{\omega}^{(l_1,l_1)}\mathcal{F}_{-\omega-\omega_h}^{(l_1',l_1')}\mathcal{F}_{-\omega'}^{(l_2,l_2)}\mathcal{F}_{\omega'+\omega_h}^{(l_2',l_2')}}}d\omega d\omega'\Bigg), & \text{if } h_1 = h_2 = h. \\ O(\frac{1}{T}), & \text{if } h_1 \neq h_2. \end{cases}$$

where $\mathcal{F}_{\omega}^{(l,l')} = \langle \mathcal{F}_{\omega}(\psi_{l'}),\psi_l\rangle$, $\mathcal{F}_{\omega_1,\omega_2,\omega_3}^{(l_1l_1',l_2l_2')} = \langle \mathcal{F}_{\omega_1,\omega_2,\omega_3}(\psi_{l_2l_2'}),\psi_{l_1l_1'}\rangle$ *and* $\psi_{ll'} = \psi_l \otimes \psi_{l'}$. *Furthermore,*

$$T\,\mathrm{Cov}(\Re\gamma_{h_1}^{(T)}(l_1,l_1'),\Im\gamma_{h_2}^{(T)}(l_2,l_2')) = O\left(\frac{1}{T}\right)$$

uniformly in $h_1,h_2 \in \mathbb{Z}$.

The proof of Theorem 4.2 is given in Appendix B. Note that the results in the theorem use at various places the fact that the k-th order spectral density operator at frequency $\boldsymbol{\lambda} = (\lambda_1,\ldots,\lambda_k)^T \in \mathbb{R}^k$ is equal to the k-th order spectral density operator at frequency $-\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ in the manifold $\sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j \mod 2\pi$.

With the previous results in place, the large-sample behavior of the quadratic form statistics $\hat{Q}_M^{(T)}$ defined in (3.5) can be derived. This is done in the following theorem.

Theorem 4.3. *Let Assumptions 3.1 and 4.2 be satisfied. Let Assumption 4.1 be satisfied with* $k = 8$ *and* $\ell = 2$ *and assume that* $\inf_\omega\langle\mathcal{F}(\psi),\psi\rangle > 0$ *for all* $\psi \in H_{\mathbb{C}}$. *Then,*

(a) For any collection $h_1,\ldots,h_M$ *bounded by* $\bar{h}$,

$$\sqrt{T}\boldsymbol{b}_M^{(T)} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \mathcal{N}_{2M}(\mathbf{0},\Sigma_0) \qquad (T\to\infty),$$

where $\xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}}$ *denotes convergence in distribution and* $\mathcal{N}_{2M}(\mathbf{0},\Sigma_0)$ *a* $2M$*-dimensional normal distribution with mean* $\mathbf{0}$ *and diagonal covariance matrix* $\Sigma_0 = \mathrm{diag}(\sigma_{0,m}^2 \colon m = 1,\ldots,2M)$ *whose elements are*

$$\sigma_{0,m}^2 = \lim_{T\to\infty}\sum_{l_i,l_i',l_2,l_2'=1}^{L} T\mathrm{Cov}\big(\Re\gamma_{h_m}^{(T)}(l_1,l_1'),\Re\gamma_{h_m}^{(T)}(l_2,l_2')\big), \qquad m = 1,\ldots,M,$$

and $\sigma_{0,M+m}^2 = \sigma_{0,m}^2$. *The explicit form of the limit is given by Theorem 4.2.*

(b) Using the result in (a), it follows that

$$\hat{Q}_M^{(T)} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \chi_{2M}^2 \qquad (T\to\infty),$$

where χ_{2M}^2 *a* χ^2*-distributed random variable with* $2M$ *degrees of freedom.*

The proof of Theorem 4.3 is provided in Appendix B. Part (b) of the theorem can now be used to construct tests with asymptotic level α. To better understand the power of the test, the next section investigates the behavior under the alternative of local stationarity.

4.2 Properties under the alternative

This section contains the counterparts of the results in Section 4.1 for locally stationary functional time series. The following conditions are essential for the large-sample results to be established here.

Assumption 4.3. Assume $(X_t^{(T)} \colon t \leqslant T, T \in \mathbb{N})$ and $(X_t^{(u)} \colon t \in \mathbb{Z})$ are as in Definition 3.1 and let $\kappa_{k;t_1,\dots,t_{k-1}}$ be a positive sequence in $L^2([0,1]^k, \mathbb{R})$ independent of T such that, for all $j = 1, \dots, k-1$ and some $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\sum_{t_1,\dots,t_{k-1} \in \mathbb{Z}} (1 + |t_j|^\ell) \|\kappa_{k;t_1,\dots,t_{k-1}}\|_2 < \infty. \tag{4.3}$$

Suppose furthermore that there exist representations

$$X_t^{(T)} - X_t^{(t/T)} = Y_t^{(T)} \qquad \text{and} \qquad X_t^{(u)} - X_t^{(v)} = (u-v) Y_t^{(u,v)}, \tag{4.4}$$

for some processes $(Y_t^{(T)} \colon t \leqslant T, T \in \mathbb{N})$ and $(Y_t^{(u,v)} \colon t \in \mathbb{Z})$ taking values in $H_{\mathbb{R}}$ whose k-th order joint cumulants satisfy

(i) $\|\mathrm{cum}(X_{t_1}^{(T)}, \dots, X_{t_{k-1}}^{(T)}, Y_{t_k}^{(T)})\|_2 \leqslant \frac{1}{T} \|\kappa_{k;t_1-t_k,\dots,t_{k-1}-t_k}\|_2$,

(ii) $\|\mathrm{cum}(X_{t_1}^{(u_1)}, \dots, X_{t_{k-1}}^{(u_{k-1})}, Y_{t_k}^{(u_k,v)})\|_2 \leqslant \|\kappa_{k;t_1-t_k,\dots,t_{k-1}-t_k}\|_2$,

(iii) $\sup_u \|\mathrm{cum}(X_{t_1}^{(u)}, \dots, X_{t_{k-1}}^{(u)}, X_{t_k}^{(u)})\|_2 \leqslant \|\kappa_{k;t_1-t_k,\dots,t_{k-1}-t_k}\|_2$,

(iv) $\sup_u \|\frac{\partial^\ell}{\partial u^\ell} \mathrm{cum}(X_{t_1}^{(u)}, \dots, X_{t_{k-1}}^{(u)}, X_{t_k}^{(u)})\|_2 \leqslant \|\kappa_{k;t_1-t_k,\dots,t_{k-1}-t_k}\|_2$.

Note that these assumptions are generalizations of the ones in Lee & Subba Rao (2016), who investigated the properties of quadratic forms of stochastic processes in a finite-dimensional setting. For fixed u_0, the process $(X_t^{(u_0)} \colon t \in \mathbb{Z})$ is stationary and thus the results of van Delft & Eichler (2016) imply that the *local k-th order cumulant spectral kernel*

$$f_{u_0;\omega_1,\dots,\omega_{k-1}}(\tau_1, \dots, \tau_k) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{k-1}} \sum_{t_1,\dots,t_{k-1} \in \mathbb{Z}} c_{u_0;t_1,\dots,t_{k-1}}(\tau_1, \dots, \tau_k) e^{-\mathrm{i} \sum_{l=1}^{k-1} \omega_l t_l} \tag{4.5}$$

exists, where $\omega_1, \dots, \omega_{k-1} \in [-\pi, \pi]$ and

$$c_{u_0;t_1,\dots,t_{k-1}}(\tau_1, \dots, \tau_k) = \mathrm{cum}\big(X_{t_1}^{(u_0)}(\tau_1), \dots, X_{t_{k-1}}^{(u_0)}(\tau_{k-1}), X_{t_0}^{(u_0)}(\tau_k)\big) \tag{4.6}$$

is the corresponding local cumulant kernel of order k at time u_0. The quantity $f_{u,\omega}$ will be referred to as the *time-varying spectral density kernel* of the stochastic process $(X_t^{(T)} \colon t \leqslant T, T \in \mathbb{N})$. This expression is formally justified by Lemma A.3.

Because of the standardization necessary in $\hat{\gamma}^{(T)}$, it is of importance to consider the properties of the estimator (3.2) in case the process is locally stationary. The next theorem shows that it is a consistent estimator of the integrated time-varying spectral density operator

$$G_\omega = \int_0^1 \mathcal{F}_{u,\omega} du,$$

where the convergence is uniform in $\omega \in [-\pi, \pi]$ with respect to $|||\cdot|||_2$.

Theorem 4.4 (Consistency and uniform convergence). *Suppose* $(X_t^{(T)} : t \leqslant T, T \in \mathbb{N})$ *satisfies Assumption 4.3 for* $\ell = 2$ *and consider the estimator* $\hat{\mathcal{F}}_\omega^{(T)}$ *in* (3.2) *with bandwidth fulfilling Assumption 3.1. Then,*

(i) $\mathbb{E}[\|\hat{\mathcal{F}}_\omega^{(T)} - G_\omega\|_2^2] = O((bT)^{-1} + b^4)$;

(ii) $\sup_{\omega\in[-\pi,\pi]} \|\hat{\mathcal{F}}_\omega^{(T)} - G_\omega\|_2 \xrightarrow{p} 0$,

uniformly in $\omega \in [-\pi, \pi]$.

The proof of Theorem 4.4 is given in Section S5 of the Appendix.

To obtain the distributional properties of $\hat{\gamma}^{(T)}$, it is necessary to replace the denominator with its deterministic limit. In analogy with Theorem 4.1, the theorem below gives conditions on the bandwidth for which this is justified under the alternative.

Theorem 4.5. *Let Assumption 4.3 be satisfied with* $k = 8$ *and* $\ell = 2$ *and assume that* $\inf_\omega \langle G_\omega(\psi), \psi\rangle > 0$ *for all* $\psi \in H_{\mathbb{C}}$. *Then,*

$$\sqrt{T}|\gamma_h^{(T)} - \hat{\gamma}_h^{(T)}| = O_p\bigg(\frac{1}{\sqrt{bT}} + b^2 + \frac{1}{b\sqrt{T}}\bigg) \qquad (T \to \infty).$$

The proof of Theorem 4.5 is given in Section S2 of the Online Supplement. The theorem shows that for $\hat{\gamma}_h^{(T)}$ to have the same asymptotic sampling properties as $\gamma_h^{(T)}$, additional requirements on the bandwidth b are needed. These are stated next.

Assumption 4.4. *The bandwidth* b *satisfies* $b \to 0$ *such that* $b\sqrt{T} \to \infty$ *as* $T \to \infty$.

The conditions imply that the bandwidth should tend to zero at a slower rate than in the stationary case. The conditions on the bandwidth imposed in this paper are in particular weaker than the ones required by Dwivedi & Subba Rao (2016) in the finite-dimensional context.

The dependence structure of $\gamma_h^{(T)}$ under the alternative is more involved than under the null of stationarity because the mean is nonzero for $h \neq 0 \mod T$. Additionally, the real and imaginary components of the covariance structure are correlated.

Theorem 4.6. *Let Assumption 4.3 be satisfied with* $k = \{2, 4\}$. *Then, for* $h = 1, \ldots, T-1$,

$$\mathbb{E}\big[\gamma_h^{(T)}(l, l')\big] = \frac{1}{2\pi}\int_0^{2\pi}\int_0^1 \frac{\mathcal{F}_{u,\omega}^{(l,l')} e^{-\mathrm{i}2\pi uh}}{(G_\omega^{(l,l)} G_{\omega+\omega_h}^{(l',l')})^{1/2}} du d\omega + O\bigg(\frac{1}{T}\bigg) = O\bigg(\frac{1}{h^2}\bigg) + O\bigg(\frac{1}{T}\bigg). \tag{4.7}$$

The covariance structure satisfies

1. $T\,\mathrm{Cov}(\Re\gamma_{h_1}^{(T)}(l_1, l_2), \Re\gamma_{h_2}^{(T)}(l_3, l_4)) =$
$$\frac{1}{4}\big[\Sigma_{h_1,h_2}^{(T)}(\boldsymbol{l}_4) + \acute{\Sigma}_{h_1,h_2}^{(T)}(\boldsymbol{l}_4) + \grave{\Sigma}_{h_1,h_2}^{(T)}(\boldsymbol{l}_4) + \bar{\Sigma}_{h_1,h_2}^{(T)}(\boldsymbol{l}_4)\big] + R_T,$$

2. $T\,\mathrm{Cov}(\Re\gamma_{h_1}^{(T)}(l_1,l_2),\Im\gamma_{h_2}^{(T)}(l_3,l_4)) =$
$$\frac{1}{4\mathrm{i}}\big[\Sigma_{h_1,h_2}^{(T)}(\boldsymbol{l}_4)-\acute{\Sigma}_{h_1,h_2}^{(T)}(\boldsymbol{l}_4)+\grave{\Sigma}_{h_1,h_2}^{(T)}(\boldsymbol{l}_4)-\bar{\Sigma}_{h_1,h_2}^{(T)}(\boldsymbol{l}_4)\big]+R_T,$$

3. $T\,\mathrm{Cov}(\Im\gamma_{h_1}^{(T)}(l_1,l_2),\Im\gamma_{h_2}^{(T)}(l_3,l_4)) =$
$$\frac{1}{4}\big[\Sigma_{h_1,h_2}^{(T)}(\boldsymbol{l}_4)-\acute{\Sigma}_{h_1,h_2}^{(T)}(\boldsymbol{l}_4)-\grave{\Sigma}_{h_1,h_2}^{(T)}(\boldsymbol{l}_4)+\bar{\Sigma}_{h_1,h_2}^{(T)}(\boldsymbol{l}_4)\big]+R_T,$$

where $\Sigma_{h_1,h_2}^{(T)}(\boldsymbol{l}_4),\acute{\Sigma}_{h_1,h_2}^{(T)}(\boldsymbol{l}_4),\grave{\Sigma}_{h_1,h_2}^{(T)}(\boldsymbol{l}_4),\bar{\Sigma}_{h_1,h_2}^{(T)}(\boldsymbol{l}_4)$ *are defined in equations (S.5.1)–(S.5.4) of the Online Supplement. and* $\|R_T\|_2=O(T^{-1})$.

The proof of Theorem 4.6 is given in Section S5 of the Appendix. The last result in this section concerns the asymptotic of $\hat{Q}_M^{(T)}$ in (3.5) in the locally stationary setting. Before stating this result, observe that the previous theorem shows that a noncentrality parameter will have to enter, since the mean of $\gamma_h^{(T)}(l,l')$ is nonzero. Henceforth, the limit of (4.7) shall be denoted by

$$\mu_h(l,l')=\frac{1}{2\pi}\int_0^{2\pi}\int_0^1\frac{\mathcal{F}_{u,\omega}^{(l,l')}e^{-\mathrm{i}2\pi uh}}{(G_\omega^{(l,l)}G_{\omega+\omega_h}^{(l',l')})^{1/2}}dud\omega$$

and its vectorization by $\boldsymbol{\mu}_h$. Following Paparoditis (2009) and Dwivedi & Subba Rao (2016), there is an intuitive interpretation of the degree of nonstationarity that can be detected in these functions. For fixed l,l' and for small h, they can be seen to approximate the Fourier coefficients of the function $\mathcal{F}_{u,\omega}^{(l,l')}/(\mathcal{F}_\omega^{(l,l)}\mathcal{F}_\omega^{(l',l')})^{1/2}$. More specifically, for small h and $T\to\infty$, they approximate

$$\vartheta_{h,j}(l,l')=\frac{1}{2\pi}\int_0^{2\pi}\int_0^1\frac{\mathcal{F}_{u,\omega}^{(l,l')}}{(G_\omega^{(l,l)}G_\omega^{(l',l')})^{1/2}}e^{\mathrm{i}2\pi uh-\mathrm{i}j\omega}dud\omega.$$

Thus, $\mu_h(l,l')\approx\vartheta_{h,0}(l,l')$. Clearly, if the process is weakly stationary, then the integrand of the coefficients does not depend on u and therefore all Fourier coefficients are zero except $\vartheta_{0,j}(l,l')$. In particular, $\mathcal{F}_{u,\omega}^{(l,l)}/G_\omega^{(l,l)}=1$ and $\vartheta_{0,0}(l,l)$ on the diagonal, while the off-diagonal elements yield coherence measures. The mean functions can now be seen to reveal long-term non-stationary behavior. Unlike testing methods based on segments in the time domain, the proposed method is consequently able to detect smoothly changing behavior in the temporal dependence structure. A precise formulation of the asymptotic properties of the test statistic under H_A is given in the next theorem.

Theorem 4.7. *Let Assumptions 3.1 and 4.4 be satisfied. Let Assumption 4.3 be satisfied with* $k=8$ *and* $\ell=2$ *and assume that* $\inf_\omega\langle\mathcal{F}_\omega(\psi),\psi\rangle>0$ *for all* $\psi\in H_{\mathbb{C}}$. *Then,*

(a) For any collection $h_1,\ldots,h_M$ *bounded by* $\bar{h}$,

$$\sqrt{T}\boldsymbol{b}_M^{(T)}\xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}}\mathcal{N}_{2M}(\boldsymbol{\mu},\Sigma_A)\qquad(T\to\infty),$$

where $\mathcal{N}_{2M}(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \Sigma_A)$ denotes a $2M$-dimensional normal distribution with mean vector $\boldsymbol{\mu}$, whose first M components are $\Re \boldsymbol{e}^T \boldsymbol{\mu}_{h_m}$ and last M components are $\Im \boldsymbol{e}^T \boldsymbol{\mu}_{h_m}$, and block covariance matrix

$$\Sigma_A = \begin{pmatrix} \Sigma_A^{(11)} & \Sigma_A^{(12)} \\ \Sigma_A^{(21)} & \Sigma_A^{(22)}. \end{pmatrix}$$

whose $M \times M$ blocks are, for $m, m' = 1, \ldots, M$, given by

$$\Sigma_A^{(11)}(m, m') = \lim_{T\to\infty} \sum_{l_1,l_2,l_3,l_4=1}^{L} \frac{1}{4}\big[\Sigma^{(T)}_{h_m,h_{m'}}(\boldsymbol{l}_4) + \acute{\Sigma}^{(T)}_{h_m,h_{m'}}(\boldsymbol{l}_4) + \grave{\Sigma}^{(T)}_{h_m,h_{m'}}(\boldsymbol{l}_4) + \bar{\Sigma}^{(T)}_{h_m,h_{m'}}(\boldsymbol{l}_4)\big],$$

$$\Sigma_A^{(12)}(m, m') = \lim_{T\to\infty} \sum_{l_1,l_2,l_3,l_4=1}^{L} \frac{1}{4\mathrm{i}}\big[\Sigma^{(T)}_{h_m,h_{m'}}(\boldsymbol{l}_4) - \acute{\Sigma}^{(T)}_{h_m,h_{m'}}(\boldsymbol{l}_4) + \grave{\Sigma}^{(T)}_{h_m,h_{m'}}(\boldsymbol{l}_4) - \bar{\Sigma}^{(T)}_{h_m,h_{m'}}(\boldsymbol{l}_4)\big],$$

$$\Sigma_A^{(22)}(m, m') = \lim_{T\to\infty} \sum_{l_1,l_2,l_3,l_4=1}^{L} \frac{1}{4}\big[\Sigma^{(T)}_{h_m,h_{m'}}(\boldsymbol{l}_4) - \acute{\Sigma}^{(T)}_{h_m,h_{m'}}(\boldsymbol{l}_4) - \grave{\Sigma}^{(T)}_{h_m,h_{m'}}(\boldsymbol{l}_4) + \bar{\Sigma}^{(T)}_{h_m,h_{m'}}(\boldsymbol{l}_4)\big],$$

where $\Sigma^{(T)}_{h_m,h_{m'}}(\boldsymbol{l}_4), \acute{\Sigma}^{(T)}_{h_m,h_{m'}}(\boldsymbol{l}_4), \grave{\Sigma}^{(T)}_{h_m,h_{m'}}(\boldsymbol{l}_4), \bar{\Sigma}^{(T)}_{h_m,h_{m'}}(\boldsymbol{l}_4)$ are as in Theorem 4.6.

(b) Using the result in (a), it follows that

$$\hat{Q}_M^{(T)} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \chi^2_{\mu,2M}, \qquad (T \to \infty),$$

where $\chi^2_{\mu,2M}$ denotes a generalized noncentral χ^2 random variable with noncentrality parameter $\mu = \|\boldsymbol{\mu}\|_2^2$ and $2M$ degrees of freedom.

The proof of Theorem 4.7 can be found in Appendix S5.

5 Empirical results

This section reports the results of an illustrative simulation study designed to verify that the large-sample theory is useful for applications to finite samples. The test is subsequently applied to annual temperature curves data. The findings provide guidelines for a further fine-tuning of the test procedures, but this will be investigated in detail in future research.

5.1 Simulation setting

To generate functional time series, the general strategy applied, for example in the papers by Aue et al. (2015) and Hörmann et al. (2015), is utilized. For this simulation study, all processes are build on a Fourier basis representation on the unit interval $[0, 1]$ with basis functions $\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_{15}$. Note that the lth Fourier coefficient of a pth-order functional autoregressive, FAR(p), process $(X_t \colon t \in \mathbb{Z})$ satisfies

$$\langle X_t, \psi_l \rangle = \sum_{l'=1}^{\infty} \sum_{t'=1}^{p} \langle X_{t-t'}, \psi_l \rangle \langle A_{t'}(\psi_l), \psi_{l'} \rangle + \langle \varepsilon_t, \psi_l \rangle$$

$$\approx \sum_{l'=1}^{L_{\max}} \sum_{t'=1}^{p} \langle X_{t-t'}, \psi_l \rangle \langle A_{t'}(\psi_l), \psi_{l'} \rangle + \langle \varepsilon_t, \psi_l \rangle, \tag{5.1}$$

the quality of the approximation depending on the choice of $L_{\max}$. The vector of the first $L_{\max}$ Fourier coefficients $\mathbf{X}_t = (\langle X_t, \psi_1 \rangle, \ldots, \langle X_t, \psi_{L_{\max}} \rangle)^\top$ can thus be generated using the pth-order vector autoregressive, VAR(p), equations

$$\mathbf{X}_t = \sum_{t'=1}^{p} \mathbf{A}_{t'} \mathbf{X}_{t-t'} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t,$$

where the (l, l') element of $\mathbf{A}_{t'}$ is given by $\langle A_{t'}(\psi_l), \psi_{l'} \rangle$ and $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t = (\langle \varepsilon_t, \psi_1 \rangle, \ldots, \langle \varepsilon_t, \psi_{L_{\max}} \rangle)^\top$. The entries of the matrices $\mathbf{A}_{t'}$ are generated as $\mathcal{N}(0, \nu_{l,l'}^{(t')})$ random variables, with the specifications of $\nu_{l,l'}$ given below. To ensure stationarity or the existence of a causal solution (see Bosq, 2000; van Delft & Eichler, 2016, for the stationary and locally stationary case, respectively), the norms $\kappa_{t'}$ of $\boldsymbol{A}_{t'}$ are required to satisfy certain conditions, for example, $\sum_{t'=1}^{p} |||\boldsymbol{A}_{t'}|||_\infty < 1$. The functional white noise, FWN, process is included in (5.1) setting $p = 0$.

All simulation experiments were implemented by means of the `fda` package in R and any result reported in the remainder of this section is based on 1000 simulation runs.

5.2 Finite sample performance under the null

Under the null hypothesis of stationarity, the following data generating processes, DGPs, were studied:

(a) The FWN variables $\varepsilon_1, \ldots, \varepsilon_T$ with coefficient variances $\mathrm{Var}(\langle \varepsilon_t, \psi_l \rangle) = \exp((l-1)/10)$;

(b) The FAR(2) variables $X_1, \ldots, X_T$ with operators specified through the respective variances $\nu_{l,l'}^{(1)} = \exp(-l - l')$ and $\nu_{l,l'}^{(2)} = 1/(l + l'^{3/2})$ and norms $\kappa_1 = 0.75$ and $\kappa_2 = -0.4$, and innovations $\varepsilon_1, \ldots, \varepsilon_T$ as in (a);

(c) The FAR(2) variables $X_1, \ldots, X_T$ as in (b) but with $\kappa_1 = 0.4$ and $\kappa_2 = 0.45$.

The sample sizes under consideration are $T = 2^n$ for $n = 6, \ldots, 11$, so that the smallest sample size consists of 64 functions and the largest of 2048. The test statistic $\hat{Q}_M^{(T)}$ in (3.5) is then set up with $L = L_{\max} = 15$ and $h_m = m$ for $m = 1, \ldots, M$ with $M = 1$, 5 and 10. A rejection is reported if the simulated test statistic value exceeds the critical level prescribed in part (b) of Theorem 4.3. The processes in (a)–(c) comprise a range of stationary scenarios. DGP (a) is the simplest model, specifying an independent FWN process. DGPs (b) and (c) exhibit second-order autoregressive dynamics of different persistence, with the process in (c) possessing the stronger temporal dependence.

The empirical rejection levels for the processes (a)–(c) can be found in Table 5.1. It can be seen that the empirical levels for the statistics $\hat{Q}_1^{(T)}$ are generally well adjusted with the notable exception of the larger samples sizes for DGP (c). Here the performance is somewhat conservative, perhaps owing to the high persistence

			% level			% level			% level	
	T	$\hat{Q}_1^{(T)}$	5	1	$\hat{Q}_5^{(T)}$	5	1	$\hat{Q}_{10}^{(T)}$	5	1
(a)	64	1.90	4.60	0.60	9.75	8.10	2.90	19.43	11.20	6.00
	128	2.05	6.40	1.60	9.85	7.30	2.70	19.95	10.40	3.80
	256	1.98	4.70	1.30	10.11	7.20	2.20	19.97	7.80	2.80
	512	2.06	5.50	1.00	10.03	6.40	1.20	20.07	6.80	2.20
	1024	2.00	6.00	1.00	9.98	4.40	1.40	19.75	5.20	1.70
	2048	2.04	5.50	1.20	10.07	5.60	0.70	20.23	4.30	1.00
(b)	64	1.78	4.00	0.90	8.94	6.10	2.00	17.73	8.40	4.70
	128	1.93	5.00	1.70	9.01	4.90	1.70	18.01	6.00	2.00
	256	1.83	4.10	1.20	9.26	5.40	0.70	18.10	5.10	1.70
	512	1.88	4.00	0.70	9.19	3.70	0.90	18.31	3.40	0.40
	1024	1.83	4.20	0.60	9.15	3.30	0.60	18.08	3.00	1.40
	2048	1.87	5.00	0.60	9.21	3.20	0.20	18.49	1.90	0.40
(c)	64	2.10	5.80	0.80	11.17	8.80	3.40	23.64	16.10	8.10
	128	1.75	4.00	0.80	8.84	4.00	0.50	17.60	4.30	1.40
	256	1.94	5.10	1.20	9.41	5.90	1.60	19.79	7.90	3.10
	512	1.73	3.30	0.60	8.36	2.20	0.20	16.80	2.30	0.10
	1024	1.62	2.70	0.20	8.19	1.40	0.20	16.22	1.90	0.40
	2048	1.66	3.00	0.40	8.23	1.70	0.10	16.49	0.70	0.20

Table 5.1: Averaged test statistic values and rejection rates of $\hat{Q}_M^{(T)}$ at the 1% and 5% asymptotic level for the processes (a)–(c) for various choices of M and T. All table entries are generated from 1000 repetitions.

in the underlying DGP. The performance for $\hat{Q}_5^{(T)}$ and $\hat{Q}_{10}^{(T)}$ shows additional features. First, rejection levels tend to be too high for smaller sample sizes and too low for larger sample sizes. The former has to do with the degrees of freedom available for the estimation, the latter points to a fact discussed further in Section 5.5 below, namely that pooling across too many fDFTs (that is, too large a value of M) does not aggregate additional information. Some evidence on closeness between empirical and limit densities is provided in Figure 5.1.

5.3 Finite sample performance under the alternative

Under the alternative, the following data generating processes are considered:

(d) The tvFAR(1) variables $X_1, \ldots, X_T$ with operator specified through the variances $\nu_{l,l'}^{(1)} = \exp(-l - l')$ and norm $\kappa_1 = 0.8$, and innovations given by (a) with added multiplicative time-varying variance

$$\sigma^2(t) = \frac{1}{2} + \cos\left(\frac{2\pi t}{2048}\right) + 0.3\sin\left(\frac{2\pi t}{2048}\right);$$

(e) The tvFAR(2) variables $X_1, \ldots, X_T$ with both operators as in (d) but with time-varying norm

$$\kappa_{1,t} = 1.8\cos\left(1.5 - \cos\left(\frac{4\pi t}{T}\right)\right),$$



Figure 5.1: Blue: Empirical density of $\hat{Q}_5^{(T)}$ for $T = 64$ (left panel) and $T = 512$ (right panel) for DGPs (a)–(c) (top to bottom). Red: The corresponding chi-squared densities predicted under the null.

constant norm $\kappa_2 = -0.81$, and innovations as in (a);

(f) The structural break FAR(2) variables $X_1, \ldots, X_T$ given in the following way.

- For $t \leqslant 3T/8$, the operators are as in (b) but with norms $\kappa_1 = 0.7$ and $\kappa_2 = 0.2$, and innovations as in (a);
- For $t > 3T/8$, the operators are as in (b) but with norms $\kappa_1 = 0$ and $\kappa_2 = -0.2$, and innovations as in (a) but with variances $\mathrm{Var}(\langle \varepsilon_t, \psi_l \rangle) = 2\exp((l-1)/10)$.

All other aspects of the simulations are as in Section 5.2. The processes studied under the alternative provide intuition for the behavior of the proposed tests under different deviations from the null hypothesis. DGP (d) is time-varying only through the innovation structure, in the form of a slowly varying variance component. The first-order autoregressive structure is independent of time. DGP (e) is a time-varying second-order FAR process for which the first autoregressive operator varies with time. The final DGP in (f) models a structural break, a different type of alternative. Here, the process is not locally stationary as prescribed under the alternative in this paper, but piecewise stationary with the two pieces being specified as two distinct FAR(2) processes.

			% level			% level			% level	
	T	$\hat{Q}_1^{(T)}$	5	1	$\hat{Q}_5^{(T)}$	5	1	$\hat{Q}_{10}^{(T)}$	5	1
(d)	64	2.3	8.1	2.2	9.9	9.9	5.2	18.9	11.8	6.3
	128	5.7	36.7	18.0	15.4	28.7	17.0	25.9	24.8	14.1
	256	42.1	100.0	99.9	70.7	100.0	99.4	87.5	99.2	97.8
	512	275.3	100.0	100.0	442.9	100.0	100.0	495.7	100.0	100.0
	1028	559.7	100.0	100.0	722.8	100.0	100.0	756.5	100.0	100.0
	2048	391.3	100.0	100.0	497.9	100.0	100.0	512.8	100.0	100.0
(e)	64	2.0	5.6	2.0	9.3	8.5	5.0	18.1	9.5	5.9
	128	2.2	7.2	2.1	10.5	10.4	5.5	20.1	11.2	5.9
	256	2.6	9.9	2.6	10.9	10.1	4.6	21.2	11.7	6.1
	512	3.0	12.4	3.7	11.6	10.6	3.8	21.9	11.5	5.1
	1024	4.6	26.9	11.6	13.3	17.3	7.1	24.2	16.5	7.8
	2048	6.7	45.3	25.5	15.4	29.8	14.7	26.3	25.2	12.8
(f)	64	6.7	44.1	23.3	16.6	32.5	20.9	27.7	30.5	21.7
	128	12.4	81.8	60.5	24.6	65.8	46.2	36.3	52.7	38.0
	256	23.3	99.3	96.8	37.7	97.0	88.4	50.1	88.2	77.2
	512	44.7	100.0	100.0	64.8	100.0	100.0	78.6	100.0	99.6
	1024	87.1	100.0	100.0	117.7	100.0	100.0	133.7	100.0	100.0
	2048	174.6	100.0	100.0	225.8	100.0	100.0	247.2	100.0	100.0

Table 5.2: Averaged test statistic values and rejection rates of $\hat{Q}_M^{(T)}$ at the 1% and 5% asymptotic level for the processes (d)–(f) for various choices of M and T. All table entries are generated from 1000 repetitions.

The empirical power of the various test statistics for the processes in (d)–(f) are in Table 5.2. Power results are roughly similar across the selected values of M. For DGP (d), power is low for the small sample sizes $T = 64$ and 128 and is at 100% for the all larger T. The low power is explained by the form of the time-varying variance which takes 2048 observations to complete a full cycle of the sine and cosine components. In the situation of the two smallest sample sizes, this slowly varying variance appears close to stationary and therefore rejections of the null are rare. Closeness of the distributions under the null hypothesis and the alternative can be measured in part by the non-centrality vector $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ (see Theorem 4.7). Table 5.4 collects information on the size of its estimated entries for $h = 1, \ldots, 10$. It can be seen from the top two panels that for DGP (d), the real and imaginary components, and the squared modulus are small for the small sample size $T = 64$. If the sample size is increased to $T = 512$, these values are much larger, in particular for small choices of h.

DGP (e) shows low power throughout. Again, the reason for this is that the form of local stationarity under consideration here resembles too closely stationary behavior expected under the null hypothesis. This is corroborated in Figure 5.2, where the empirical version of the non-central generalized chi-squared limit under the alternative is closely aligned with the standard chi-squared limit expected under the null hypothesis. The corresponding entries of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ remain small even for $T = 512$ as shown in the third panel of Table 5.4.

The results for DGP (f) indicate that the proposed statistics has power against structural break alternatives. This statement is supported by Figure 5.2 and thenon-centrality estimates given in Table 5.4.

5.4 Application to annual temperature curves

To give an instructive data example, the proposed method was applied to annual temperature curves recorded at several measuring stations across Australia over the last century and a half. The exact locations and lengths of the functional time series are reported in Table 5.5, and the annual temperature profiles recorded at the Gayndah station are displayed for illustration in the left panel of Figure 5.3. To test whether these annual temperature profiles constitute stationary functional time series or not, the proposed testing method was utilized, using specifications similar to those in the simulation study. Namely, the test statistic $\hat{Q}_M^{(T)}$ in (3.5) was applied with $L = 15$, $h_m = m$ for $m = 1, \ldots, M$ with $M = 1$, 5 and 10. The estimation of the spectrum needed to compute $\hat{Q}_M^{(T)}$ was achieved based on the concave smoothing kernel $K(x) = 6(0.25 - x^2)$ with compact support on $x \in [-1/2, 1/2]$ and bandwidth $b = T^{-1/4}$. To estimate the tri-spectrum, the estimator as proposed in Brillinger & Rosenblatt (1967) was used with kernel constructed as $K_4(x_1, \ldots, x_4) = \prod_{j=1}^{3} K_{b_4}(x_j)$, where $K_{b_4}(x) = \frac{1}{b_4} K(\frac{x}{b_4})$ and bandwidth $b_4 = T^{-1/6}$. It should be noted that the outcomes of this data analysis were not sensitive with respect to the bandwidth choices.

The testing results are summarized in Table 5.5. It can be seen that across all measuring stations, stationarity is rejected in favor of the alternative. The plot of $\hat{Q}_M^{(T)}$ against M in Figure 5.3 also shows an aggregation



Figure 5.2: Blue: Empirical density of $\hat{Q}_5^{(T)}$ for $T = 64$ (left panel) and $T = 512$ (right panel) for DGPs (d)–(f) (top to bottom). Red: The corresponding chi-squared densities predicted under the null.

effect at play, as values of the test statistic seem to explode with increasing M, albeit at different rates.

Further features of the data analysis are highlighted in Figure 5.4. The behavior of the squared modulus of the entries of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ and the estimated upper diagonal of the covariance matrix $\hat{\Sigma}_0$ seen in the top panel indicate a somewhat stable behavior for the Sydney, Gayndah, Hobart and Robe stations, with the estimated non-centrality parameter still far removed from zero. As expected there is a visible decay for the non-centrality elements with increasing lag. Given the moderate sample sizes and the range of lags under consideration, it is difficult to discern, however, whether this decay is quadratic as predicted by the theory.

Figure 5.4 also shows the modulus of the estimates of the second- and fourth-order spectral components of Σ_0 (see Theorem 4.2). The former is seen to be quite stable across lags with a visible decay, while the latter are far more unstable, in particular at Cape Otway, Gunnedah and Boulia Airport stations. It therefore has a bigger influence on the shape of the variance. The real and imaginary parts of the estimated fourth-order spectral component plotted in Figure 5.4 show that the real part is mostly responsible for the observed departure from Gaussianity and that the imaginary part seems to converge at larger lags. The plots in the middle (and bottom) row of Figure 5.4 hint at a potential seasonal component at lags 7–9, which might have been influenced by greater climate variations due to effects such as El Niño, but additional analysis is needed to support this hypothesis.

Finally, the bottom row of Figure 5.4 displays the squared modulus and the real and imaginary parts of the elements of $\hat{b}_M^{(T)}$, which show clear deviations from the behavior expected under the null. Moreover, covariation between the real and imaginary components at across lags potentially provides another source of nonstationary behavior.



Figure 5.3: Plot of annual temperature curves at Gayndah station (left) and values of $\hat{Q}_M^{(T)}$ (right).

5.5 Towards an automated test procedure

As indicated in Section 5.2, a further analysis of the simulation results as well as the application may provide the seed for the development of a selection procedure for M. Some ideas are put forward in this section, but details will be left to future research. A crucial ingredient for the selection of M and the corresponding frequencies h_m (in the above $h_m = m$ but other choices can be entertained) is the size of the various $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{h_m}^{(T)}$ in (3.4) whose real and imaginary part make up the vector $\hat{\mathbf{b}}_M^{(T)}$ in the test statistics $\hat{Q}_M^{(T)}$. Computing the values $|\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{h_m}^{(T)}|^2$ over $m = 1, \ldots, M$ shows that these values are uniformly small across both m and sample sizes T under the null of stationarity of the underlying functional time series. Under the alternative of local stationarity (as well as in the structural break scenario), several $|\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{h_m}^{(T)}|^2$ are comparatively large. These m should be chosen by a selection procedure, for example through a thresholding approach to be developed. For illustration purposes, Table 5.3 shows the size of $|\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{h_m}^{(T)}|^2$ across a range of options considered in the simulations. The general observation deduced from running a multitude of simulations under both null and alternative scenarios is that the $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{h_m}^{(T)}$ are rather constant under stationarity but appear to display different behavior for the non-stationary processes under consideration.

Figure 5.5 provides contour plots of $\hat{\gamma}_1^{(T)}$ for model (b) under the null and for models (d)–(f) under the alternative. The contours are obtained from averaging (over the simulation runs) the aggregated contributions $\hat{\gamma}_1^{(T)}(l, l')$ and evaluating these contributions in the direction of $\psi_l \otimes \psi_{l'}$ for $l, l' = 1, \ldots, L$. It can be seen that the magnitude of the contours provides another indicator for how easy or hard it may be to reject the null hypothesis. The top row in the figure is for the stationary DGP (b). For any of the sample sizes considered, the magnitudes across $[0, 1]^2$ remains small, as expected under the null. The behavior under the alternative is markedly different, but the specifics depend on the type of alternative. For the time-varying noise process (d), the contribution of non-stationarity is at the diagonal, with the magnitude along this ridge increasing significantly with the sample size. For DGP (e), the form of non-stationarity creates very different contours. The structural break process (f) induces non-stationarity in the contours in a similar way as DGP (d), with strong concentration occurring at the diagonal for all sample sizes. Any future refinement of the tests will have to take these features into account.

		$h=1$	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
(a)	$T=64$	0.0009	0.0009	0.0009	0.0010	0.0009	0.0009	0.0009	0.0008	0.0008	0.0008
	128	0.0010	0.0010	0.0009	0.0009	0.0009	0.0010	0.0009	0.0009	0.0009	0.0009
	256	0.0010	0.0010	0.0010	0.0010	0.0009	0.0010	0.0009	0.0010	0.0009	0.0009
	512	0.0010	0.0010	0.0010	0.0010	0.0009	0.0010	0.0010	0.0010	0.0009	0.0009
	1024	0.0010	0.0009	0.0010	0.0010	0.0009	0.0009	0.0010	0.0009	0.0010	0.0009
	2048	0.0010	0.0010	0.0010	0.0010	0.0010	0.0010	0.0010	0.0010	0.0010	0.0010
(d)	$T=64$	0.0012	0.0010	0.0010	0.0010	0.0009	0.0009	0.0009	0.0008	0.0009	0.0008
	128	0.0030	0.0014	0.0013	0.0011	0.0011	0.0011	0.0011	0.0011	0.0010	0.0010
	256	0.0218	0.0063	0.0036	0.0026	0.0022	0.0020	0.0018	0.0016	0.0016	0.0015
	512	0.1428	0.0440	0.0206	0.0129	0.0093	0.0071	0.0059	0.0052	0.0047	0.0041
	1024	0.2905	0.0597	0.0131	0.0068	0.0050	0.0041	0.0037	0.0034	0.0032	0.0031
	2048	0.2032	0.0373	0.0145	0.0019	0.0016	0.0014	0.0015	0.0015	0.0017	0.0016
(f)	$T=64$	0.0035	0.0017	0.0011	0.0012	0.0011	0.0011	0.0011	0.0010	0.0010	0.0011
	128	0.0066	0.0022	0.0013	0.0017	0.0013	0.0012	0.0013	0.0011	0.0011	0.0012
	256	0.0124	0.0029	0.0013	0.0020	0.0014	0.0013	0.0014	0.0012	0.0013	0.0012
	512	0.0238	0.0046	0.0017	0.0030	0.0014	0.0016	0.0016	0.0012	0.0014	0.0014
	1024	0.0464	0.0081	0.0019	0.0047	0.0016	0.0019	0.0022	0.0012	0.0017	0.0014
	2048	0.0931	0.0148	0.0029	0.0078	0.0019	0.0027	0.0031	0.0012	0.0025	0.0018

Table 5.3: Average squared modulus $|\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_h^{(T)}|^2$ for various lags h and sample sizes T, and DGPs (a), (d) and (f).

		$h=1$	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
(d)	$\Re e^T\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_h$	-0.0258	-0.0477	-0.0511	-0.0518	-0.0518	-0.0515	-0.0511	-0.0506	-0.0500	-0.0494
$T=64$	$\Im e^T\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_h$	-1.1352	-0.5573	-0.3651	-0.2688	-0.2108	-0.1719	-0.1439	-0.1227	-0.1061	-0.0927
	$\lvert e^T\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_h\rvert^2$	1.2894	0.3128	0.1359	0.0749	0.0471	0.0322	0.0233	0.0176	0.0138	0.0110
(d)	$\Re e^T\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_h$	7.0449	1.6332	0.6577	0.3332	0.1855	0.1060	0.0584	0.0276	0.0066	-0.0084
$T=512$	$\Im e^T\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_h$	-8.7057	-5.8700	-3.9407	-2.9542	-2.3601	-1.9636	-1.6802	-1.4675	-1.3021	-1.1697
	$\lvert e^T\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_h\rvert^2$	125.4200	37.1239	15.9615	8.8381	5.6045	3.8668	2.8264	2.1544	1.6956	1.3684
(e)	$\Re e^T\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_h$	0.6836	0.0383	-0.0057	-0.0011	-0.0005	-0.0005	-0.0005	-0.0006	-0.0006	-0.0006
$T=512$	$\Im e^T\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_h$	-0.0889	-0.0416	-0.0237	-0.0187	-0.0158	-0.0138	-0.0123	-0.0112	-0.0104	-0.0097
	$\lvert e^T\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_h\rvert^2$	0.4752	0.0032	0.0006	0.0003	0.0003	0.0002	0.0002	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001
(f)	$\Re e^T\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_h$	-1.7403	1.2473	-0.5544	0.0000	0.3729	-0.3936	0.2517	0.0300	-0.1874	0.2588
$T=512$	$\Im e^T\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_h$	4.2015	1.2473	0.2296	1.2291	0.1545	0.3936	0.6077	-0.0000	0.4525	0.2588
	$\lvert e^T\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_h\rvert^2$	20.6809	3.1117	0.3600	1.5107	0.1629	0.3098	0.4327	0.0009	0.2399	0.1339

Table 5.4: Real and imaginary components and squared modulus of non-centrality vector $\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$.

Station	T	$M = 1$	$M = 5$	$M = 10$
Boulia Airport	120	20.08	960.12	1821.96
Robe	129	24.60	550.24	870.42
Cape Otway	149	328.44	697.17	1750.08
Gayndah Post Office	117	195.09	923.29	1667.61
Gunnedah Pool	133	501.05	1917.97	2594.20
Hobart	121	24.60	550.24	870.42
Melbourne	158	114.37	316.60	949.15
Sydney	154	81.85	257.36	678.04

Table 5.5: Summary of results for eight Australian measuring stations. The column labeled T reports the sample size. The columns labeled $M = 1$, $M = 5$ and $M = 10$ provide the values of $\hat{Q}_M^{(T)}$ in (3.5).



Figure 5.4: Upper panel: Squared modulus of estimated non-centrality elements $|\boldsymbol{e}^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_h|^2$ (left) and of estimated variances $\hat{\sigma}^2_{0,m}$ (middle) and modulus of second-order spectral components (right). Middle panel: Modulus of fourth-order spectral component (left) and its real (middle) and imaginary (right) part. Lower panel: Squared modulus (left), real (middle) and imaginary (right) part of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_h^{(T)}$ averaged over $l, l' = 1, \ldots, L$.



Figure 5.5: Contour plots of $\hat{\gamma}_1^{(T)}$ for various sample sizes T and DGPs (b) and (d)–(f) (top to bottom).

6 Conclusions

In this paper methodology for testing the stationarity of a functional time series is put forward. The tests are based on frequency domain analysis and exploit that fDFTs at different canonical frequencies are uncorrelated if and only if the underlying functional time series are stationary. The limit distribution of the quadratic form-type test statistics has been determined under the null hypothesis as well as under the alternative of local stationarity. Finite sample properties were highlighted in simulation experiments with various data generating processes and an application to annual temperature profiles, where deviations from stationarity were detected. The empirical results show promise for further applications to real data, but future research has to be devoted to a further fine-tuning of the proposed method.

A Properties of functional cumulants

For random elements $X_1, \dots, X_k$ in a Hilbert space H, the *moment tensor of order* k can be defined as

$$\mathbb{E}\big[X_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes X_k\big] = \sum_{l_1,\dots l_k \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{E}\Big[\prod_{t=1}^{k} \langle X_t, \psi_{l_t}\rangle\Big](\psi_{l_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \psi_{l_k}),$$

where the elementary tensors $(\psi_{l_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \psi_{l_k} \colon l_1, \dots, l_k \in \mathbb{N})$ form an orthonormal basis in the tensor product space $\bigotimes_{j=1}^{k} H$. The latter follows since $(\psi_l \colon l \in \mathbb{N})$ is an orthornormal basis of the separable Hilbert space H. Similarly, define the *k-th order cumulant tensor* by

$$\operatorname{cum}\big(X_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes X_k\big) = \sum_{l_1,\dots l_k \in \mathbb{N}} \operatorname{cum}\Big(\prod_{t=1}^{k} \langle X_t, \psi_{l_t}\rangle\Big)(\psi_{l_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \psi_{l_k}), \tag{A.1}$$

where the cumulants on the right hand side are as usual given by

$$\operatorname{cum}\big(\langle X_1, \psi_{l_1}\rangle, \dots, \langle X_k, \psi_{l_k}\rangle\big) = \sum_{\nu=(\nu_1,\dots,\nu_p)} (-1)^{p-1}\,(p-1)! \prod_{r=1}^{p} \mathbb{E}\Big[\prod_{t\in\nu_r} \langle X_t, \psi_{l_t}\rangle\Big],$$

where the summation extends over all unordered partitions ν of $\{1, \dots, k\}$. The following is a generalization of the product theorem for cumulants (Brillinger, 1981, Theorem 2.3.2).

Theorem A.1. *Consider the tensor $X_t = \otimes_{j=1}^{J_t} X_{tj}$ for random elements X_{tj} in H with $j = 1, \dots, J_t$ and $t = 1, \dots, k$. Let $\nu = \{\nu_1, \dots \nu_p\}$ be a partition of $\{1, \dots, k\}$. The joint cumulant tensor* $\operatorname{cum}(X_1, \dots, X_k)$ *is given by*

$$\operatorname{cum}(X_1, \dots, X_k) = \sum_{r_{11},\dots,r_{kJ_t}} \sum_{\nu=(\nu_1,\dots,\nu_p)} \prod_{n=1}^{p} \operatorname{cum}\big(\langle X_{tj}, \psi_{r_{tj}}\rangle | (t,j) \in \nu_n\big)\, \psi_{r_{11}} \otimes \cdots \otimes \psi_{r_{kJ_t}},$$

where the summation extends over all indecomposable partitions $\nu = (\nu_1, \dots, \nu_p)$ of the table

$$\begin{matrix} (1,1) & \cdots & (1,J_1) \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ (k,1) & \cdots & (k,J_t). \end{matrix}$$

Formally, abbreviate this by

$$\operatorname{cum}(X_1,\dots,X_k) = \sum_{\nu=(\nu_1,\dots,\nu_p)} S_\nu\Big(\otimes_{n=1}^p \operatorname{cum}\big(X_{tj}|(t,j)\in\nu_n\big)\Big),$$

where S_ν is the permutation that maps the components of the tensor back into the original order, that is, $S_\nu(\otimes_{r=1}^p \otimes_{(t,j)\in\nu_r} X_{tj}) = X_{11}\otimes\cdots\otimes X_{kJ_t}$.

Next, results for cumulants of the fDFT are stated under both stationarity and local stationarity regimes.

Lemma A.1 (Cumulants of the fDFT under stationarity). *Let $(X_t\colon t\in\mathbb{Z})$ be a k-th order stationary sequence taking values in $H_\mathbb{R}$ that satisfies Assumption 4.1. The cumulant operator of the fDFT then satisfies*

$$\operatorname{cum}\big(D^{(T)}_{\omega_{j_1}},\dots,D^{(T)}_{\omega_{j_k}}\big) = \frac{(2\pi)^{k/2-1}}{T^{k/2}}\Delta_T^{(\sum_{l=1}^k \omega_{j_l})}\mathcal{F}_{\omega_{j_1},\dots,\omega_{j_{k-1}}} + R_{T,k}, \tag{A.2}$$

where the function $\Delta_T^{(\omega)} = T$ for $\omega\equiv 0 \mod 2\pi$, $\Delta_T^{(\omega_k)} = 0$ for $k\not\equiv 0 \mod T$ and the remainder satisfies $\|R_{T,k}\|_2 = O(T^{-k/2})$.

The proof of this lemma can be found in Panaretos & Tavakoli (2013). To give the analog of Lemma A.1 in the locally stationary case, a number of auxiliary statements will be made first. The proofs of the following three lemmas can be found in the Online Supplement.

Lemma A.2. *Let Assumption 4.3 be satisfied and $c_{u;t_1,\dots,t_{k-1}}$ as given in* (4.6)*. Then,*

$$\begin{aligned}&\Big\|\operatorname{cum}\big(X^{(T)}_{t_1},\dots,X^{(T)}_{t_{k-1}},X^{(T)}_{t_k}\big) - c_{t_1/T;t_1-t_k,\dots,t_{k-1}-t_k}\Big\|_2\\ &\qquad\leqslant \left(\frac{k}{T}+\sum_{j=1}^{k-1}\Big|\frac{t_j-t_k}{T}\Big|\right)\|\kappa_{k;t_1-t_k,\dots,t_{k-1}-t_k}\|_2.\end{aligned}$$

Lemma A.3. *Consider a sequence of functional processes $(X_t^{(T)}\colon t\leqslant T, T\in\mathbb{N})$ satisfying Assumption 4.3 with $k=2$ and $\ell=2$. Then, this triangular array uniquely characterizes the time-varying local spectral density operator*

$$\mathcal{F}_{u,\omega} = \frac{1}{2\pi}\sum_{h\in\mathbb{Z}}\mathfrak{C}_{u,h}e^{-\mathrm{i}\omega h}, \tag{A.3}$$

which belongs to $S_2(H)$. Its kernel satisfies

(i) $\sup_{u,\omega}\|\frac{\partial^i}{\partial u^i}f_{u,\omega}\|_2<\infty$ *for* $i=1,2$,

(ii) $\sup_{u,\omega}\|\frac{\partial^i}{\partial^i\omega}f_{u,\omega}\|_2<\infty$ *for* $i=1,2$,

(iii) $\sup_{u,\omega}\|\frac{\partial^2}{\partial\omega\partial u}f_{u,\omega}\|_2<\infty$.

The cumulants of the local fDFT can be expressed in terms of the time-varying spectral operator. At the Fourier frequencies, the time-varying spectral operator can be shown to possess a well-defined Fourier transform. The properties of the resulting Fourier coefficients make apparent that the dependence structure of the local fDFT behaves in a very specific manner that is based on the distance of the frequencies. The coefficients additionally provide an upper bound on the norm of the cumulant operator. This is summarized in the next lemma.

Lemma A.4. *Suppose Assumption 4.3 holds true. Then the cumulant operator of the local fDFT satisfies*

$$\begin{aligned}\operatorname{cum}\big(D^{(T)}_{\omega_{j_1}},\dots,D^{(T)}_{\omega_{j_k}}\big) &= \frac{(2\pi)^{k/2-1}}{T^{k/2}}\sum_{t=0}^{T-1}\mathcal{F}_{t/T;\omega_{j_1},\dots,\omega_{j_{k-1}}}e^{-\mathrm{i}\sum_{l=1}^{k}t\omega_{j_l}}+R_{k,T} \qquad \text{(A.4)}\\ &= \frac{(2\pi)^{k/2-1}}{T^{k/2-1}}\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{j_1+\dots+j_k;\omega_{j_1},\dots,\omega_{j_{k-1}}}+R_{k,T},\end{aligned}$$

where $\|R_{k,T}\|_2 = O(T^{-k/2})$ *and the operator*

$$\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{s;\omega_{j_1},\dots,\omega_{j_{k-1}}} = \int_0^1 \mathcal{F}_{u;\omega_{j_1},\dots,\omega_{j_{k-1}}}e^{-\mathrm{i}2\pi su}du \qquad \text{(A.5)}$$

denotes the s*-th Fourier coefficient of* $\mathcal{F}_{u;\omega_{j_1},\dots,\omega_{j_{k-1}}}$ *and is Hilbert–Schmidt. Furthermore,*

$$\|\!|\operatorname{cum}(D^{(T)}_{\omega_{j_1}},\dots,D^{(T)}_{\omega_{j_k}})|\!\|_2 \leqslant \frac{C}{T^{k/2-1}|j_1+\dots+j_k|^l}+O\bigg(\frac{1}{T^{k/2}}\bigg) \qquad \text{(A.6)}$$

for some constant $C>0$*.*

In case the process does not depend on u, we have $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{s;\omega_{j_1},\dots,\omega_{j_{k-1}}} = O_H$ for $s\neq 0$. That is, the operator $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{s;\omega_{j_1},\dots,\omega_{j_{2k-1}}}$ maps any $\phi\in L^2([0,1]^k,\mathbb{C})$ to the origin for $s\neq 0$.

Lemma A.5 (Cumulants of the fDFT under local stationarity). *Let* $(X_{t,T}\colon t\leqslant T, T\in\mathbb{N})$ *be a* k*-th order locally stationary process in* H *satisfying Assumption 4.3. The cumulant operator of the local fDFT satisfies*

$$\begin{aligned}\operatorname{cum}(D^{(T)}_{\omega_{j_1}},\dots,D^{(T)}_{\omega_{j_k}}) &= \frac{(2\pi)^{k/2-1}}{T^{k/2}}\sum_{t=0}^{T-1}\mathcal{F}_{\frac{t}{T};\omega_{j_1},\dots,\omega_{j_{k-1}}}e^{-\mathrm{i}\sum_{l=1}^{k}t\omega_{j_l}}+R_{T,k} \qquad \text{(A.7)}\\ &= \frac{(2\pi)^{k/2-1}}{T^{k/2-1}}\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{j_1+\dots+j_k;\omega_{j_1},\dots,\omega_{j_{k-1}}}+R_{T,k}, \qquad \text{(A.8)}\end{aligned}$$

where the remainder satisfies $\|R_{T,k}\|_2 = O(T^{-k/2})$*.*

This lemma is a slight reformulation of the first part of Lemma A.4 and provides the locally stationary version of Lemma A.1. The operators (A.2) and (A.7) are Hilbert–Schmidt operators and belong in particular to $S_1(H)$ for $k=2$ if the process is driven by a functional white noise process, which can be shown using Parseval's Identity (see, for example, Panaretos & Tavakoli, 2013; van Delft & Eichler, 2016). The corollary below is a direct consequence of Lemma A.4.

Corollary A.1. *If Assumption 4.3 holds with $\ell = 2$, then*

(i) $\|\!|\mathrm{cum}(D^{(T)}_{\omega_{j_1}}, \ldots, D^{(T)}_{\omega_{j_k}})|\!\|_2 \leqslant \dfrac{C}{T^{k/2-1}|j_1 + \cdots + j_k|^2} + O\Big(\dfrac{1}{T^{k/2}}\Big)$;

(ii) $\sup\limits_{\omega} \sum\limits_{s\in\mathbb{Z}} \|\!|\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{s;\omega}|\!\|_2 \leqslant \infty$.

B Proofs under the null hypothesis of stationarity

Let $(\psi_l \colon l \in \mathbb{N})$ be an orthonormal basis of $H_{\mathbb{C}}$. Then $(\psi_{l_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \psi_{l_k} \colon l_1, \ldots, l_k \in \mathbb{N})$ is an orthonormal basis of $H^k_{\mathbb{C}}$. To ease notation, denote the elementary tensor $\psi_{ll'} = \psi_l \otimes \psi_{l'}$. Write $D^{(l)}_{\omega} = \langle D^{(T)}_{\omega}, \psi_l\rangle$, $\mathcal{F}^{(l,l')}_{\omega} = \langle \mathcal{F}_{\omega}(\psi_{l'}), \psi_l\rangle$ and $\mathcal{F}^{(lm,l'm')}_{\omega_{j_1},\omega_{j_2},\omega_{j_3}} = \langle \mathcal{F}_{\omega_{j_1},\omega_{j_2},\omega_{j_3}}(\psi_{l'm'}), \psi_{lm}\rangle$. Recall that the sequence $(D^{(T)}_{\omega_j})$ has mean zero. Ignoring the denominator for the moment, Theorem A.1 leads to the following covariance structure of the fDfT's:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Cov}\big(D^{(l_1)}_{\omega_{j_1}} D^{(l_2)}_{\omega_{j_2}}, D^{(l_3)}_{\omega_{j_3}} D^{(l_4)}_{\omega_{j_4}}\big) &= \mathbb{E}\Big[D^{(l_1)}_{\omega_{j_1}} D^{(l_2)}_{\omega_{j_2}} \overline{D^{(l_3)}_{\omega_{j_3}} D^{(l_4)}_{\omega_{j_4}}}\Big] - \mathbb{E}\Big[D^{(l_1)}_{\omega_{j_1}} D^{(l_2)}_{\omega_{j_2}}]\mathbb{E}[\overline{D^{(l_3)}_{\omega_{j_3}} D^{(l_4)}_{\omega_{j_4}}}\Big] \\ &= \mathrm{cum}\big(D^{(l_1)}_{\omega_{j_1}}, D^{(l_2)}_{\omega_{j_2}}, \overline{D^{(l_3)}_{\omega_{j_3}}}, \overline{D^{(l_4)}_{\omega_{j_4}}}\big) \\ &\quad + \mathrm{cum}\big(D^{(l_1)}_{\omega_{j_1}}, \overline{D^{(l_3)}_{\omega_{j_3}}}\big)\mathrm{cum}\big(D^{(l_2)}_{\omega_{j_2}}, \overline{D^{(l_4)}_{\omega_{j_4}}}\big) \\ &\quad + \mathrm{cum}\big(D^{(l_1)}_{\omega_{j_1}}, \overline{D^{(l_4)}_{\omega_{j_4}}}\big)\mathrm{cum}\big(D^{(l_2)}_{\omega_{j_2}}, \overline{D^{(l_3)}_{\omega_{j_3}}}\big)\end{aligned} \tag{B.1}$$

for $l_1, l_2, l_3, l_4 \in \mathbb{N}$. In particular,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Cov}\big(D^{(l_1)}_{\omega_{j_1}} D^{(l_2)}_{-\omega_{j_1+h_1}}, D^{(l_3)}_{\omega_{j_2}} D^{(l_4)}_{-\omega_{j_2+h_2}}\big) &= \mathrm{cum}\big(D^{(l_1)}_{\omega_{j_1}}, D^{(l_2)}_{-\omega_{j_1+h_1}}, D^{(l_3)}_{-\omega_{j_2}}, D^{(l_4)}_{\omega_{j_2+h_2}}\big) \\ &\quad + \mathrm{cum}(D^{(l_1)}_{\omega_{j_1}}, D^{(l_3)}_{-\omega_{j_2}})\mathrm{cum}\big(D^{(l_2)}_{-\omega_{j_1+h_1}}, D^{(l_4)}_{\omega_{j_2+h_2}}\big) \\ &\quad + \mathrm{cum}(D^{(l_1)}_{\omega_{j_1}}, D^{(l_4)}_{\omega_{j_2+h_2}})\mathrm{cum}\big(D^{(l_2)}_{-\omega_{j_1+h_1}}, D^{(l_3)}_{-\omega_{j_2}}\big).\end{aligned}$$

Given the underlying assumptions are satisfied for $k = 4$, Lemma A.1 implies this can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{(2\pi)}{T^2}\sum_{t=1}^{T} \mathcal{F}^{(l_1\,l_2,l_3\,l_4)}_{t/T;\omega_{j_1},-\omega_{j_1+h_1},-\omega_{j_2}} e^{-\mathrm{i}t(\omega_{h_2}-\omega_{h_1})} + O\Big(\frac{1}{T^2}\Big) \\ &+ \bigg[\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T} \mathcal{F}^{(l_1,l_3)}_{t/T,\omega_{j_1}} e^{-\mathrm{i}t(\omega_{j_1}-\omega_{j_2})} + O\Big(\frac{1}{T}\Big)\bigg]\bigg[\frac{1}{T}\sum_{s=1}^{T} \mathcal{F}^{(l_2,l_4)}_{s/T,-\omega_{j_1+h_1}} e^{-\mathrm{i}s(-\omega_{j_1+h_1}+\omega_{j_2+h_2})} + O\Big(\frac{1}{T}\Big)\bigg] \\ &+ \bigg[\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T} \mathcal{F}^{(l_1,l_4)}_{t/T,\omega_{j_1}} e^{-\mathrm{i}t(\omega_{j_1}+\omega_{j_2+h_2})} + O\Big(\frac{1}{T}\Big)\bigg]\bigg[\frac{1}{T}\sum_{s=1}^{T} \mathcal{F}^{(l_2,l_3)}_{s/T,-\omega_{j_1+h_1}} e^{-\mathrm{i}s(-\omega_{j_1+h_1}-\omega_{j_2})} + O\Big(\frac{1}{T}\Big)\bigg].\end{aligned} \tag{B.2}$$

Proof of Theorem 4.2. By Lemma A.1, for $h = 1, \ldots, T-1$,

$$\mathbb{E}\big[\sqrt{T}\gamma^{(T)}_h(l,l')\big] = \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}\sum_{j=1}^{T}\bigg[\frac{\mathcal{F}^{(l,l')}_{\omega_j}}{(\mathcal{F}^{(l,l)}_{\omega_j}\mathcal{F}^{(l',l')}_{\omega_{j+h}})^{1/2}}\frac{1}{T}\Delta^{(T)}(h) + O\Big(\frac{1}{T}\Big)\bigg] = O\Big(\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}\Big). \tag{B.3}$$

For the covariance structure under the null hypothesis, use that (B.2) becomes

$$\frac{1}{T}\sum_{j_1,j_2=1}^{T}\Bigg(\frac{(2\pi)}{T^2}\mathcal{F}^{(l_1\,l_2,l_3\,l_4)}_{\omega_{j_1},-\omega_{j_1+h_1},-\omega_{j_2}}\Delta_T^{(\omega_{h_2}-\omega_{h_1})}+O\Big(\frac{1}{T^2}\Big)$$
$$+\left[\mathcal{F}^{(l_1,l_3)}_{\omega_{j_1}}\frac{1}{T}\Delta_T^{(\omega_{j_1}-\omega_{j_2})}+O\Big(\frac{1}{T}\Big)\right]\left[\mathcal{F}^{(l_2,l_4)}_{-\omega_{j_1+h_1}}\frac{1}{T}\Delta_T^{(\omega_{j_1+h_1}-\omega_{j_2+h_2})}+O\Big(\frac{1}{T}\Big)\right]$$
$$+\left[\mathcal{F}^{(l_1,l_4)}_{\omega_{j_1}}\frac{1}{T}\Delta_T^{(\omega_{j_1}+\omega_{j_2+h_2})}+O\Big(\frac{1}{T}\Big)\right]\left[\mathcal{F}^{(l_2,l_3)}_{-\omega_{j_1+h_1}}\frac{1}{T}\Delta_T^{(-\omega_{j_1+h_1}-\omega_{j_2})}+O\Big(\frac{1}{T}\Big)\right]\Bigg).$$

In case $h_1 \neq h_2$, the first line is of order $O(T^{-1})$. In the second and third line, it can be seen that the cross terms and final terms are of order $O(T^{-1})$ uniformly in ω_j. The first product term in the second line will only be of order $O(1)$ if $j_1 = j_2$ and $j_1 + h_1 = j_2 + h_2$, while in the third line this requires $j_1 = -j_2 - h_2$ and $j_2 = -j_1 - h_1$. Therefore,

$$\mathrm{Cov}\Big(\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}\sum_{j_1=1}^{T}D^{(l_1)}_{\omega_1}D^{(l_2)}_{-\omega_{j_1+h_1}},\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}\sum_{j_2=1}^{T}D^{(l_3)}_{\omega_{j_2}}D^{(l_4)}_{-\omega_{j_2+h_2}}\Big)$$
$$=\begin{cases}\dfrac{1}{T}\displaystyle\sum_{j_1=1}^{T}\Big(\mathcal{F}^{(l_1,l_3)}_{\omega_{j_1}}\mathcal{F}^{(l_2,l_4)}_{-\omega_{j_1+h}}+\mathcal{F}^{(l_1,l_4)}_{\omega_{j_1}}\mathcal{F}^{(l_2,l_3)}_{-\omega_{j_1+h}}\Big)\\ \quad+\dfrac{2\pi}{T^2}\displaystyle\sum_{j_1,j_2=1}^{T}\mathcal{F}^{(l_1\,l_2,l_3\,l_4)}_{\omega_{j_1},-\omega_{j_1+h},-\omega_{j_2}}, & \text{if } h_1=h_2=h,\\ O\Big(\dfrac{1}{T}\Big), & \text{if } h_1\neq h_2,\end{cases} \tag{B.4}$$

while the covariance of the complex conjugate is given by

$$\mathrm{Cov}\Big(\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}\sum_{j_1=1}^{T}D^{(l_1)}_{-\omega_1}D^{(l_2)}_{\omega_{j_1+h_1}},\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}\sum_{j_2=1}^{T}D^{(l_3)}_{-\omega_{j_2}}D^{(l_4)}_{\omega_{j_2+h_2}}\Big)$$
$$=\begin{cases}\dfrac{1}{T}\displaystyle\sum_{j_1=1}^{T}\Big(\mathcal{F}^{(l_1,l_3)}_{-\omega_{j_1}}\mathcal{F}^{(l_2,l_4)}_{\omega_{j_1+h}}+\mathcal{F}^{(l_1,l_4)}_{\omega_{-j_1}}\mathcal{F}^{(l_2,l_3)}_{\omega_{j_1+h}}\Big)\\ \quad+\dfrac{2\pi}{T^2}\displaystyle\sum_{j_1,j_2=1}^{T}\mathcal{F}^{(l_1\,l_2,l_3\,l_4)}_{-\omega_{j_1},\omega_{j_1+h},\omega_{j_2}}, & \text{if } h_1=h_2=h.\\ O\Big(\dfrac{1}{T}\Big), & \text{if } h_1\neq h_2.\end{cases}$$

Similarly, $T\mathrm{Cov}(\gamma^{(T)}_{h_1}(l_1,l_2),\overline{\gamma^{(T)}_{h_1}(l_3,l_4)}) = O(T^{-1})$ for $h_2 \neq T - h_1$. Since

$$\Re\gamma^{(T)}_{h_1}(l_1,l_2)=\frac{1}{2}\Big(\gamma^{(T)}_{h_1}(l_1,l_2)+\overline{\gamma^{(T)}_{h_1}(l_1,l_2)}\Big)$$

and

$$\Im\gamma^{(T)}_{r_1}(l_1,l_2)=\frac{1}{2\mathrm{i}}\Big(\gamma^{(T)}_{h_1}(l_1,l_2)-\overline{\gamma^{(T)}_{h_1}(l_1,l_2)}\Big),$$

it follows that

$$T\mathrm{Cov}\big(\Re\gamma_{h_1}^{(T)}(l_1,l_2),\Im\gamma_{h_2}^{(T)}(l_3,l_4)\big)=O(T^{-1})$$

uniformly in h_1,h_2. All together, the above derivation yields

$$\begin{aligned}T\,\mathrm{Cov}\big(\Re\gamma_{h_1}^{(T)}(l_1,l_2),\Re\gamma_{h_2}^{(T)}(l_3,l_4)\big)&=T\,\mathrm{Cov}\big(\Im\gamma_{h_1}^{(T)}(l_1,l_2),\Im\gamma_{h_2}^{(T)}(l_3,l_4)\big)\\&=\frac{T}{2}\mathrm{Cov}\big(\gamma_{h_1}^{(T)}(l_1,l_2),\gamma_{h_2}^{(T)}(l_3,l_4)\big),\end{aligned}$$

which, for, $h_1=h_2=h$, is equal to

$$\begin{aligned}&T\,\mathrm{Cov}\big(\gamma_{h}^{(T)}(l_1,l_2),\gamma_{h}^{(T)}(l_3,l_4)\big)\\&\quad=\frac{(2\pi)}{T^2}\sum_{j_1,j_2=1}^{T}\frac{\mathcal{F}^{(l_1\,l_2,l_3\,l_4)}_{\omega_{j_1},-\omega_{j_1+h},-\omega_{j_2}}}{(\mathcal{F}^{(l_1,l_1)}_{\omega_{j_1}}\mathcal{F}^{(l_2,l_2)}_{-\omega_{j_1+h}}\mathcal{F}^{(l_3,l_3)}_{-\omega_{j_2}}\mathcal{F}^{(l_4,l_4)}_{\omega_{j_2+h}})^{1/2}}+O\Big(\frac{1}{T^2}\Big)\\&\quad+\frac{1}{T}\sum_{j=1}^{T}\Big[\frac{\mathcal{F}^{(l_1,l_3)}_{\omega_j}}{(\mathcal{F}^{(l_1,l_1)}_{\omega_j}\mathcal{F}^{(l_3,l_3)}_{-\omega_j})^{1/2}}+O\Big(\frac{1}{T}\Big)\Big]\Big[\frac{\mathcal{F}^{(l_2,l_4)}_{-\omega_{j+h}}}{(\mathcal{F}^{(l_2,l_2)}_{-\omega_{j+h}}f^{(l_4,l_4)}_{\omega_{j+h}})^{1/2}}+O\Big(\frac{1}{T}\Big)\Big]\\&\quad+\frac{1}{T}\sum_{j=1}^{T}\Big[\frac{\mathcal{F}^{(l_1,l_4)}_{\omega_j}}{(\mathcal{F}^{(l_1,l_1)}_{\omega_j}\mathcal{F}^{(l_4,l_4)}_{-\omega_j})^{1/2}}+O\Big(\frac{1}{T}\Big)\Big]\Big[\frac{\mathcal{F}^{(l_2,l_3)}_{-\omega_{j+h}}}{(\mathcal{F}^{(l_2,l_2)}_{-\omega_{j+h}}\mathcal{F}^{(l_3,l_3)}_{\omega_{j+h}})^{1/2}}+O\Big(\frac{1}{T}\Big)\Big].\end{aligned}$$

If the spectra are Lipschitz, the covariance structure of $\sqrt{T}\gamma^{(T)}$ is thus given by

$$\begin{aligned}&T\,\mathrm{Cov}\big(\Re\gamma_{h_1}^{(T)}(l_1,l_2),\Re\gamma_{h_2}^{(T)}(l_3,l_4)\big)\\&\quad=T\,\mathrm{Cov}\big(\Im\gamma_{h_1}^{(T)}(l_1,l_2),\Im\gamma_{h_2}^{(T)}(l_3,l_4)\big)\\&\quad=\begin{cases}\dfrac{1}{4\pi}\Big(\displaystyle\int\frac{\mathcal{F}^{(l_1,l_3)}_{\omega}\mathcal{F}^{(l_2,l_4)}_{-\omega-\omega_h}}{\sqrt{\mathcal{F}^{(l_1,l_1)}_{\omega}\mathcal{F}^{(l_3,l_3)}_{-\omega}\mathcal{F}^{(l_2,l_2)}_{-\omega-\omega_h}\mathcal{F}^{(l_4,l_4)}_{\omega+\omega_h}}}d\omega+\int\frac{\mathcal{F}^{(l_1,l_4)}_{\omega}\mathcal{F}^{(l_2,l_3)}_{-\omega-\omega_h}}{\sqrt{\mathcal{F}^{(l_1,l_1)}_{\omega}\mathcal{F}^{(l_4,l_4)}_{-\omega}\mathcal{F}^{(l_2,l_2)}_{-\omega-\omega_h}\mathcal{F}^{(l_3,l_3)}_{\omega+\omega_h}}}d\omega\\\qquad+\displaystyle\int\int\frac{\mathcal{F}^{(l_1\,l_2,l_3\,l_4)}_{\omega,-\omega-\omega_h,-\lambda}}{\sqrt{\mathcal{F}^{(l_1,l_1)}_{\omega}\mathcal{F}^{(l_2,l_2)}_{-\omega-\omega_h}\mathcal{F}^{(l_3,l_3)}_{-\omega'}\mathcal{F}^{(l_4,l_4)}_{\omega'+\omega_h}}}d\omega d\omega'\Big)&\text{if } h_1=h_2=h,\\O\Big(\dfrac{1}{T}\Big)&\text{if } h_1\neq h_2.\end{cases}\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, $T\,\mathrm{Cov}(\Re\gamma_{h_1}^{(T)}(l_1,l_2),\Im\gamma_{h_2}^{(T)}(l_3,l_4))=O(T^{-1})$ uniformly in $h_1,h_2\in\mathbb{Z}$.

The above result implies in particular for the variance that

$$\begin{aligned}&T\,\mathrm{Cov}\big(\Re\gamma_{h_1}^{(T)}(l_1,l_2),\Re\gamma_{h_2}^{(T)}(l_1,l_2)\big)\\&\quad=T\,\mathrm{Cov}\big(\Im\gamma_{h_1}^{(T)}(l_1,l_2),\Im\gamma_{h_2}^{(T)}(l_1,l_2)\big)\\&\quad=\begin{cases}\dfrac{1}{4\pi}\Big(2\pi+\displaystyle\int\frac{\mathcal{F}^{(l_1,l_2)}_{\omega}\mathcal{F}^{(l_2,l_1)}_{-\omega-\omega_h}}{\sqrt{\mathcal{F}^{(l_1,l_1)}_{\omega}\mathcal{F}^{(l_2,l_2)}_{-\omega}\mathcal{F}^{(l_2,l_2)}_{-\omega-\omega_h}\mathcal{F}^{(l_1,l_1)}_{\omega+\omega_h}}}d\omega\\\qquad+\displaystyle\int\int\frac{\mathcal{F}^{(l_1\,l_2,l_1\,l_2)}_{\omega,-\omega-\omega_h,-\omega'}}{\sqrt{\mathcal{F}^{(l_1,l_1)}_{\omega}\mathcal{F}^{(l_2,l_2)}_{-\omega-\omega_h}\mathcal{F}^{(l_1,l_1)}_{-\omega'}\mathcal{F}^{(l_2,l_2)}_{\omega'+\omega_h}}}d\omega d\omega'\Big)&\text{if } h_1=h_2=h,\\O\Big(\dfrac{1}{T}\Big)&\text{if } h_1\neq h_2,\end{cases}\end{aligned}$$

and $T\,\mathrm{Cov}(\Re\gamma_{h_1}^{(T)}(l_1,l_2),\Im\gamma_{h_2}^{(T)}(l_1,l_2)) = O(T^{-1})$ uniformly in $h_1, h_2 \in \mathbb{Z}$. □

Proof of Theorem 4.3. The derivation of the distributional properties under the null can be found in the Online Supplement. □

C Proofs under the alternative hypothesis of local stationarity

Proof of Theorem 4.4. (i) In order to prove the first assertion of the theorem, introduce the bias–variance decomposition

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{E}\Big[\big\|\hat{\mathcal{F}}_\omega^{(T)} - \mathbb{E}\big[\hat{\mathcal{F}}_\omega^{(T)}\big] + \mathbb{E}\big[\hat{\mathcal{F}}_\omega^{(T)}\big] - G_\omega\big\|_2^2\Big] \\ &\quad = \mathbb{E}\Big[\big\|\hat{\mathcal{F}}_\omega^{(T)} - \mathbb{E}\big[\hat{G}_\omega\big]\big\|_2^2\Big] + \mathbb{E}\Big[\big\|\mathbb{E}\big[\hat{\mathcal{F}}_\omega^{(T)}\big] - G_\omega\big\|_2^2\Big].\end{aligned} \tag{C.1}$$

The cross terms cancel because $\mathbb{E}[\langle\hat{\mathcal{F}}_\omega^{(T)} - \mathbb{E}[\hat{\mathcal{F}}_\omega^{(T)}], \mathbb{E}[\hat{\mathcal{F}}_\omega^{(T)}] - G_\omega\rangle_{H\otimes H}]$ and $\mathbb{E}[\hat{\mathcal{F}}_\omega^{(T)} - \mathbb{E}[\hat{\mathcal{F}}_\omega^{(T)}]] = O_H$. Now, by Lemma A.1,

$$\mathrm{cum}\big(D_\omega^{(T)}, D_{-\omega}^{(T)}\big) = \frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=0}^{T-1}\mathcal{F}_{t/T,\omega} + R_{T,2} = G_\omega^{(T)} + R_{T,2},$$

where $\|R_{T,2}\|_2 = O(T^{-1})$. Convolution of the cumulant tensor with the smoothing kernel and subsequently a Taylor expansion gives

$$\mathbb{E}\big[\hat{\mathcal{F}}_\omega^{(T)}\big] = \frac{2\pi}{bT}\sum_{-=1}^{T} K_b(\omega-\omega_j)\mathrm{cum}\big(D_\omega^{(T)}, D_{-\omega}^{(T)}\big) = G_\omega + \epsilon_{b,T},$$

where $\|\epsilon_{b,T}\|_2 = O(b^2 + (bT))^{-1}$ and the interchange of summations is justified by Fubini's Theorem since $\sup_{\omega,u}\|f_{u,\omega}\|_2 < \infty$ and $\sup_{\omega,u}\|\frac{\partial^2}{\partial\omega_2}f_{u,\omega}\|_2 < \infty$,. Here, the error term $(bT)^{-1}$ follows from discretization of the window function (see, for example, Lemma P5.1 of Brillinger, 1981). Note that the integral approximation in time direction does not change the error term because of Lipschitz continuity in u. Thus, the second term in (C.1) satisfies

$$\mathbb{E}\big[\|\mathbb{E}\hat{\mathcal{F}}_\omega^{(T)} - G_\omega\|_2^2\big] = O\bigg(b^2 + \frac{1}{bT}\bigg)^2.$$

To bound the first term of the right–hand side in (C.1), observe that, for $\omega \neq \omega'$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{cum}(D_\omega^{(T)}, D_{\omega'}^{(T)}) &= \frac{1}{2\pi T}\sum_{t,t'=1}^{T}\mathrm{cum}(X_t^{(T)}, X_{t'}^{(T)})e^{-\mathrm{i}(t\omega+t'\omega')} \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi T}\sum_{t,t'=1}^{T}\mathcal{C}_{t/T;t'-t}(\tau,\tau')e^{-\mathrm{i}(t'-t)\omega'-\mathrm{i}t(\omega+\omega')} + \epsilon_{t-t',T} \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\sum_{|h|\leqslant T-t}\mathrm{cum}(X_t^{(T)}, X_{t+h}^{(T)})e^{-\mathrm{i}(h\omega')-\mathrm{i}t(\omega+\omega')} + R_{T,2}\end{aligned}$$

$$= \frac{1}{2\pi T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\sum_{|h|\leqslant T-t}\mathcal{F}_{t/T,h}e^{-\mathrm{i}(h\omega')-\mathrm{i}t(\omega+\omega')} + R_{T,2}, \tag{C.2}$$

where Lemma A.2 was applied to obtain the second equality sign and since further also

$$\|\epsilon_T\|_2 = \frac{1}{2\pi T}\sum_{t_1=1}^{T}\frac{1+|t_1-t_2|}{T}\|\kappa_{2;t_1-t_2}\|_2 = O\Big(\frac{1}{T}\Big)$$

by (4.3). Decompose the corresponding local autocovariance operator of (C.2) as

$$\frac{1}{2\pi T}\Big(\sum_{h=0}^{T-1}\sum_{t=1}^{T-h}\mathcal{C}_{t/T;h}e^{-\mathrm{i}(h\omega')-\mathrm{i}t(\omega+\omega')} + \sum_{h=-T+1}^{-1}\sum_{t=1}^{T-|h|}\mathcal{C}_{t/T;h}e^{-\mathrm{i}(h\omega')-\mathrm{i}t(\omega+\omega')}\Big) + R_{T,2}. \tag{C.3}$$

Under Assumption 4.3,

$$\begin{aligned}\Big\|\frac{1}{2\pi T}\sum_{h=0}^{T-1}\sum_{t=1}^{T-h}\mathcal{C}_{t/T,h}e^{-\mathrm{i}(h\omega')-\mathrm{i}t(\omega+\omega')}\Big\|_2 &\leqslant \frac{1}{2\pi T}\sum_{h=0}^{T-1}\Big|\sum_{t=1}^{T-h}e^{-\mathrm{i}t(\omega+\omega')}\Big|\big\|\mathcal{C}_{t/T,h}\big\|_2\\ &\leqslant \frac{1}{2\pi T}\sum_{h=0}^{T-1}|\Delta_{T-h}^{(\omega+\omega')}|\big\|\mathcal{C}_{t/T,h}\big\|_2 \leqslant \frac{C}{T}\sum_{h\in\mathbb{Z}}|h|\|\kappa_{2;h}\|_2 = O\Big(\frac{1}{T}\Big)\end{aligned}$$

for some constant C. A similar derivation shows the same bound holds for the second term of (C.3). It can therefore be concluded that $\big\|\mathrm{cum}(D_\omega^{(T)}, D_\lambda^{(T)})\big\|_2 = O(T^{-1})$ uniformly in $\omega \neq \omega', 0 \leqslant \omega, \omega' < \pi$. Furthermore, Lemma A.1 and Minkowski's Inequality yield

$$\begin{aligned}\Big\|\mathrm{cum}(D_\omega^{(T)}, D_{-\omega}^{(T)}, D_{\omega'}^{(T)}, D_{-\omega'}^{(T)})\Big\|_2 &\leqslant \frac{1}{T}\Big\|\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=0}^{T-1}\mathcal{F}_{\frac{t}{T},\omega,-\omega,\omega'}\Big\|_2 + O\Big(\frac{1}{T^2}\Big)\\ &= \frac{1}{T}\Big\|G^{(T)}_{\omega,-\omega,\omega'}\Big\|_2 + O\Big(\frac{1}{T^2}\Big) = O\Big(\frac{1}{T}\Big).\end{aligned}$$

The last equality follows since $\sup_{u,\omega}\|\mathcal{F}_{t/T,\omega,-\omega,\omega'}\|_2 \leqslant \sum_{h_1,h_2,h_3\in\mathbb{Z}}\|\kappa_{3;h_1,h_2,h_3}\|_2 = O(1)$ by Assumption 4.3. Therefore the product theorem for cumulant tensors (Theorem A.1) implies that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Cov}\big(I_\omega^{(T)}, I_{\omega'}^{(T)}\big) &= \mathrm{cum}\big(D_\omega^{(T)}, D_{-\omega}^{(T)}, D_{-\omega'}^{(T)}, D_{\omega'}^{(T)}\big)\\ &\quad + S_{1324}\Big(\mathrm{cum}\big(D_\omega^{(T)}, D_{-\omega'}^{(T)}\big)\otimes\mathrm{cum}\big(D_{-\omega}^{(T)}, D_{\omega'}^{(T)}\big)\Big)\\ &\quad + S_{1423}\Big(\mathrm{cum}\big(D_\omega^{(T)}, D_{\omega'}^{(T)}\big)\otimes\mathrm{cum}\big(D_{-\omega}^{(T)}, D_{-\omega'}^{(T)}\big)\Big),\end{aligned} \tag{C.4}$$

where S_{ijkl} denotes the permutation operator on $\otimes_{i=1}^4 L^2_{\mathbb{C}}([0,1])$ that permutes the components of a tensor according to the permutation $(1,2,3,4)\mapsto(i,j,k,l)$, that is, $S_{ijkl}(x_1\otimes\cdots\otimes x_4) = x_i\otimes\cdots\otimes x_l$. It is clear from (C.4) that $\|\mathrm{Cov}(I_\omega^{(T)}, I_{\omega'}^{(T)})\|_2 = O(T^{-1})$ for $\omega'\neq\omega, 0\leqslant\omega,\omega'<\pi$, while for $\omega'=\omega$ it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\big\|\mathrm{Cov}\big(I_\omega^{(T)}, I_\omega^{(T)}\big)\big\|_2 \leqslant &\Big\|S_{1324}\Big(\mathrm{cum}\big(D_\omega^{(T)}, D_{-\omega}^{(T)}\big)\otimes\mathrm{cum}\big(D_{-\omega}^{(T)}, D_\omega^{(T)}\big)\Big)\Big\|_2\\ &+ \Big\|S_{1423}\Big(\mathrm{cum}\big(D_\omega^{(T)}, D_\omega^{(T)}\big)\otimes\mathrm{cum}\big(D_{-\omega}^{(T)}, D_{-\omega}^{(T)}\big)\Big)\Big\|_2 + R_{T,2} = O(1).\end{aligned} \tag{C.5}$$

Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned}\operatorname{Cov}\big(\hat{\mathcal{F}}_\omega^{(T)},\hat{\mathcal{F}}_\omega^{(T)}\big) = \ & \left(\frac{2\pi}{T}\right)^2 \sum_{j,j'=1}^{T} K_b(\omega-\omega_j)K_b(\omega-\omega_{j'}) \\ & \times \frac{1}{T^2}\Bigg(\sum_{t,t'=0}^{T-1} \mathcal{F}_{t/T,\omega_j}\otimes\mathcal{F}_{t/T,-\omega_j} e^{-\mathrm{i}(t-t')(\omega_j-\omega_{j'})} \\ & \quad + \sum_{t,t'=0}^{T-1} \mathcal{F}_{t/T,\omega_j}\otimes\mathcal{F}_{t/T,-\omega_j} e^{-\mathrm{i}(t-t')(\omega_j+\omega_{j'})}\Bigg) + R_{T,2}. \end{aligned} \tag{C.6}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}&\Big\|\operatorname{Cov}(\hat{\mathcal{F}}_\omega^{(T)},\hat{\mathcal{F}}_\omega^{(T)})\Big\|_2 \leqslant \\ &\quad \sup_{u,\omega}\big\|\mathcal{F}_{u,\omega}\big\|_2^2\left(\frac{2\pi}{T}\right)^2 \sum_{j,j'=1}^{T} K_b(\omega-\omega_j)K_b(\omega-\omega_{j'})\frac{|\Delta_T^{(\omega_j-\omega_{j'})}|^2}{T^2} \\ &\quad + \sup_{u,\omega}\big\|\mathcal{F}_{u,\omega}\big\|_2^2\left(\frac{2\pi}{T}\right)^2 \sum_{j,j'=1}^{T} K_b(\omega-\omega_j)K_b(\omega-\omega_{j'})\frac{|\Delta_T^{(\omega_j+\omega_{j'})}|^2}{T^2} + O\left(\frac{1}{T}\right) \\ &\quad = O\left(\frac{1}{bT}\right). \end{aligned} \tag{C.7}$$

Together with the equivalence of the Hilbert–Schmidt norm of the operator and the L_2–norm of its kernel, the above implies then that the second term of (C.1) satisfies

$$\mathbb{E}\big[\|\hat{\mathcal{F}}_\omega^{(T)} - \mathbb{E}\hat{\mathcal{F}}_\omega^{(T)}\|_2^2\big] = \int_{[0,1]^2} \operatorname{Var}(\hat{f}_\omega^{(T)}(\tau,\tau'))d\tau d\tau' = O\left(\frac{1}{bT}\right)$$

uniformly in $\omega \in [-\pi,\pi]$. This establishes (i).

(ii) The second part of the proof proceeds along similar lines as Paparoditis (2009). An application of Minkowski's inequality yields

$$\begin{aligned}\big\|\hat{\mathcal{F}}_\omega^{(T)} - G_\omega\big\|_2 \leqslant & \left\|\frac{2\pi}{T}\sum_{j=1}^{T} K_b(\omega_{j'}-\omega_j)\left[\operatorname{cum}(D_{\omega_j}^{(T}, D_{-\omega_j}^{(T)}) - \frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}\mathcal{F}_{t/T,\omega_j}\right]\right\|_2 \\ & + \left\|\frac{2\pi}{T}\sum_{j=1}^{T} K_b(\omega_{j'}-\omega_j)\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}\big[f_{t/T,\omega_j} - \mathcal{F}_{t/T,\omega}\big]\right\|_2 \\ & + \left\|\left(\frac{2\pi}{T}\sum_{j=1}^{T} K_b(\omega_{j'}-\omega_j) - 1\right)\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}\mathcal{F}_{t/T,\omega}\right\|_2. \end{aligned}$$

Markov's inequality together with (i), which is not affected by the discretization of the integral, imply the first term tends to zero. Since the spectral operator is Lipschitz continuous in ω, the second term is bounded by

$$\left|1 - \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} K_b(\omega_k-\omega')d\omega'\right||b| = O\left(1+\frac{1}{bT}\right)O(b) = O(b).$$

Finally, the third term is seen to be of order $O((bT)^{-1})$. □

Proof of Theorem 4.6. By Lemma A.1, the expectation of $\gamma_h^{(T)}(l,l')$ satisfies

$$\mathbb{E}\big[\gamma_h^{(T)}(l,l')\big] = \frac{1}{T}\sum_{j=1}^{T}\left[\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=0}^{T-1}\frac{\mathcal{F}^{(l,l')}_{t/T,\omega_j}}{(G^{(l,l)}_{\omega_j}G^{(l',l')}_{\omega_{j+h}})^{1/2}}e^{-\mathrm{i}t\omega_h} + O\Big(\frac{1}{T}\Big)\right] = O\Big(\frac{1}{h^2}+\frac{1}{T}\Big),$$

for all $h = 1,\ldots,T-1$. Using the Lipschitz continuity of the spectra, expression (4.7) follows. For the covariance structure, note once more that

$$\Re\gamma_h^{(T)}(l,l') = \frac{1}{2}\Big(\gamma_h^{(T)}(l,l') + \overline{\gamma_h^{(T)}(l,l')}\Big) \quad \text{and} \quad \Im\gamma_h^{(T)}(l,l') = \frac{1}{2\mathrm{i}}\Big(\gamma_h^{(T)}(l,l') - \overline{\gamma_h^{(T)}(l,l')}\Big).$$

Under the alternative, these are in fact correlated and four separate cases will have to be considered:

(i) $$\begin{aligned}\operatorname{Cov}\big(\Re\gamma_{h_1}^{(l_1,l_2)},\Re\gamma_{h_2}^{(l_3,l_4)}\big) = \frac{1}{4}\Big[&\operatorname{Cov}\big(\gamma_{h_1}^{(l_1,l_2)},\gamma_{h_2}^{(l_3,l_4)}\big) + \operatorname{Cov}\big(\gamma_{h_1}^{(l_1,l_2)},\overline{\gamma_{h_2}^{(l_3,l_4)}}\big)\\ &+ \operatorname{Cov}\big(\overline{\gamma_{h_1}^{(l_1,l_2)}},\gamma_{h_2}^{(l_3,l_4)}\big) + \operatorname{Cov}\big(\overline{\gamma_{h_1}^{(l_1,l_2)}},\overline{\gamma_{h_2}^{(l_3,l_4)}}\big)\Big];\end{aligned}$$

(ii) $$\begin{aligned}\operatorname{Cov}\big(\Re\gamma_{h_1}^{(l_1,l_2)},\Im\gamma_{h_2}^{(l_3,l_4)}\big) = \frac{1}{4\mathrm{i}}\Big[&\operatorname{Cov}\big(\gamma_{h_1}^{(l_1,l_2)},\gamma_{h_2}^{(l_3,l_4)}\big) - \operatorname{Cov}\big(\gamma_{h_1}^{(l_1,l_2)},\overline{\gamma_{h_2}^{(l_3,l_4)}}\big)\\ &+ \operatorname{Cov}\big(\overline{\gamma_{h_1}^{(l_1,l_2)}},\gamma_{h_2}^{(l_3,l_4)}\big) - \operatorname{Cov}\big(\overline{\gamma_{h_1}^{(l_1,l_2)}},\overline{\gamma_{h_2}^{(l_3,l_4)}}\big)\Big];\end{aligned}$$

(iii) $$\begin{aligned}\operatorname{Cov}\big(\Im\gamma_{h_1}^{(l_1,l_2)},\Re\gamma_{h_2}^{(l_3,l_4)}\big) = \frac{1}{4\mathrm{i}}\Big[&\operatorname{Cov}\big(\gamma_{h_1}^{(l_1,l_2)},\gamma_{h_2}^{(l_3,l_4)}\big) + \operatorname{Cov}\big(\gamma_{h_1}^{(l_1,l_2)},\overline{\gamma_{h_2}^{(l_3,l_4)}}\big)\\ &- \operatorname{Cov}\big(\overline{\gamma_{h_1}^{(l_1,l_2)}},\gamma_{h_2}^{(l_3,l_4)}\big) - \operatorname{Cov}\big(\overline{\gamma_{h_1}^{(l_1,l_2)}},\overline{\gamma_{h_2}^{(l_3,l_4)}}\big)\Big];\end{aligned}$$

(iv) $$\begin{aligned}\operatorname{Cov}\big(\Im\gamma_{h_1}^{(l_1,l_2)},\Im\gamma_{h_2}^{(l_3,l_4)}\big) = \frac{1}{4}\Big[&\operatorname{Cov}\big(\gamma_{h_1}^{(l_1,l_2)},\gamma_{h_2}^{(l_3,l_4)}\big) - \operatorname{Cov}\big(\gamma_{h_1}^{(l_1,l_2)},\overline{\gamma_{h_2}^{(l_3,l_4)}}\big)\\ &- \operatorname{Cov}\big(\overline{\gamma_{h_1}^{(l_1,l_2)}},\gamma_{h_2}^{(l_3,l_4)}\big) + \operatorname{Cov}\big(\overline{\gamma_{h_1}^{(l_1,l_2)}},\overline{\gamma_{h_2}^{(l_3,l_4)}}\big)\Big].\end{aligned}$$

The expressions for the covariance structure of $\sqrt{T}\gamma_h^{(T)}$ and its complex conjugate are provided in the Online Supplement. □

Proof of Theorem 4.7. See Sections S3 and S4 of the Online Supplement. □

References

Antoniadis, A. & T. Sapatinas (2003). Wavelet methods for continuous time prediction using Hilbert-valued autoregressive processes. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis* **87**, 133–158.

Aue, A., Dubart Nourinho, D. & S. Hörmann (2015). On the prediction of stationary functional time series. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **110**, 378–392.

Aue, A. & L. Horváth (2013). Structural breaks in time series. *Journal of Time Series Analysis* **34**, 1–16.

Aue, A. & A. van Delft (2016). Online supplement to "Testing for stationarity of functional time series in the frequency domain".

Besse, P., Cardot, H. & D. Stephenson (2000). Autoregressive forecasting of some functional climatic variations. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics* **27**, 673–687.

Bosq, D. (2000). *Linear Processes in Function Spaces.* Springer-Verlag, New York.

Brillinger, D. (1981). *Time Series: Data Analysis and Theory.* McGraw Hill, New York.

Brillinger, D. & M. Rosenblatt (1967). Asymptotic theory of estimates of k-th order spectra. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, USA* **57**, 206–210.

Cremers, H. & D. Kadelka (1986). On weak convergence of integral functions of stochastic processes with applications to processes taking paths in L_p^E. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications* **21**, 305–317.

Dahlhaus, R. (1997). Fitting time series models to nonstationary processes. *The Annals of Statistics* **25**, 1–37.

Dwivedi, Y. & Subba Rao, S. (2016). A test for second-order stationarity of a time series based on the discrete Fourier transform. *Journal of Time Series Analysis* **32**, 68–91.

Ferraty, F. & Vieu, P. (2010). *Nonparametric Functional Data Analysis.* Springer-Verlag, New York.

Hörmann, S., Kidziński, Ł. & M. Hallin (2015). Dynamic functional principal components. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series B* **77**, 319–348.

Hörmann, S. & P. Kokoszka (2010). Weakly dependent functional data. *The Annals of Statistics* **38**, 1845–1884.

Horváth, L. & P. Kokoszka (2012). *Inference for Functional Data with Applications.* Springer-Verlag, New York.

Horváth, L. Kokoszka, P. & G. Rice (2014). Testing stationarity of functional time series. *Journal of Econometrics* **179**, 66–82.

Hsing, T. & R. Eubank (2015). *Theoretical Foundations of Functional Data Analysis, with an Introduction to Linear Operators.* Wiley, New York.

Lee, J. & S. Subba Rao (2016). A note on general quadratic forms of nonstationary stochastic processes. Technical Report, Texas A&M University.

Panaretos, V. & S. Tavakoli (2013). Fourier analysis of stationary time series in function space. *The Annals of Statistics* **41**, 568–603.

Paparoditis, E. (2009). Testing temporal constancy of the spectral structure of a time series. *Bernoulli* **15**, 1190–1221.

Priestley, M.B. & T. Subba Rao (1969). A test for non-stationarity of time-series. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series B* **31**, 140–149.

Ramsay, J.O. & B.W. Silverman (2010). *Functional Data Analysis (2nd ed.).* Springer-Verlag, New York.

Van Delft, A. & M. Eichler (2016). Locally stationary functional time series. `https://arxiv.org/pdf/1602.05125v2.pdf`, Maastricht University. *Submitted for publication*.

Von Sachs, R. & M.H. Neumann (1999). A wavelet-based test for stationarity. *Journal of Time Series Analysis* **21**, 597–613.

Online Supplement to "Testing for stationarity of functional time series in the frequency domain"[1]

Alexander Aue[2] Anne van Delft[3]

January 10, 2017

Abstract

This supplement contains additional technical material necessary to complete the proofs of theorems of the main paper Aue & van Delft (2016). Section S1 contains the proofs of several auxiliary lemmas stated in Appendix A of the main paper. Section S2 contains results on finding bounds for the denominator of the test statistic. Sections S3 and S4 deal with convergence of the finite-dimensional distributions and tightness. Section S5 establishes the asymptotic covariance structure of the test under the alternative of local stationarity.

Keywords: Frequency domain methods, Functional data analysis, Locally stationary processes, Spectral analysis

MSC 2010: Primary: 62G99, 62H99, Secondary: 62M10, 62M15, 91B84

S1 Properties of functional cumulants

Proof of Lemma A.2. By linearity of the cumulant operation, consecutively taking differences leads, by equation (4.4) of the main paper and the triangle inequality, to

$$\begin{aligned}\Big\|\mathrm{cum}\big(X_{t_1}^{(T)},\ldots,X_{t_k}^{(T)}\big)-\mathrm{cum}\big(X_{t_1}^{(t_1/T)},\ldots,X_{t_k}^{(t_k/T)}\big)\Big\|_2 &= \Big\|\sum_{j=1}^{k}\mathrm{cum}\big(X_{t_1}^{(T)},\ldots,Y_{t_j}^{(T)},\ldots,X_{t_k}^{(T)}\big)\Big\|_2\\ &\leqslant K\frac{k}{T}\|\kappa_{k;t_1-t_k,\ldots,t_{k-1}-t_k}\|_2,\end{aligned}$$

using part (i) of Assumption 4.3. By (4.4),

$$X_{t_j}^{(t_j/T)}-X_{t_j}^{(t_k/T)}=\frac{(t_j-t_k)}{T}Y_{t_j}^{(t_j/T,t_k/T)}. \tag{S1.1}$$

[1]This research was partially supported by NSF grants DMS 1305858 and DMS 1407530

[2]Department of Statistics, University of California, Davis, CA 95616, USA, email: aaue@ucdavis.edu

[3]Insitute of Statistics, Biostatistics and Actuarial Sciences, Université catholique de Louvain, Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium, email: anne.vandelft@uclouvain.be

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned}&\Big\|\mathrm{cum}\big(X_{t_1}^{(t_1/T)},\ldots,X_{t_k}^{(t_k/T)}\big)-c_{t_1/T;t_1-t_k,\ldots,t_{k-1}-t_k}\Big\|_2\\&\qquad\leqslant\sum_{j=1}^{k-1}\frac{|t_j-t_k|}{T}\|\kappa_{k;t_1-t_k,\ldots,t_{k-1}-t_k}\|_2,\end{aligned}$$

which follows from part (iii) of Assumption 4.3 Minkowski's inequality then implies the lemma. □

Proof of Lemma A.3. Using Lemma A.2, it is straightforward to show that $(X_t^T\colon t\leqslant T, T\in\mathbb{N})$ uniquely determines the time-varying spectral density operator, that is,

$$\int_{-\pi}^{\pi}\|\mathcal{F}_{u,\omega}^{(T)}-\mathcal{F}_{u,\omega}\|_2^2\,d\omega=o(1)\qquad(T\to\infty).\tag{S1.2}$$

Existence of the derivatives follow from the dominated convergence theorem and the product rule for differentiation in Banach spaces (Nelson, 1969). □

Proof of Lemma A.4. The first line of (A.4) follows on replacing the cumulants $\mathrm{cum}(X_{t_1}^{(T)},\ldots,X_{t_{k-1}}^{(T)},X_{t_k}^{(T)})$ with $c_{t_k/T;t_1-t_k,\ldots,t_{k-1}-t_k}$ and Lemma A.2. The second line because the discretization of the integral is an operation of order $O(T^{-2})$.

By Assumption 4.3 (iv), the kernel of $\frac{\partial}{\partial u}\mathcal{F}_{u;\omega_1,\ldots,\omega_{k-1}}$ satisfies

$$\Big\|\sup_u\frac{\partial}{\partial u}f_{u;\omega_1,\ldots,\omega_{k-1}}\Big\|_2\leqslant\frac{1}{(2\pi)^{k-1}}\sum_{t_1,\ldots,t_k}\|\kappa_{k;t_1-t_k,\ldots,t_{k-1}-t_k}\|_2<\infty.$$

The dominated convergence theorem therefore yields

$$\sup_{u,\omega_1,\ldots,\omega_{k-1}}\Big\|\frac{\partial}{\partial u}f_{u,\omega_1,\ldots,\omega_{k-1}}\Big\|_2<\infty.\tag{S1.3}$$

Finally, integration by parts for a periodic function in $L^2([0,1]^k)$ with existing n-th directional derivative in u, yields

$$\begin{aligned}&\|\tilde{f}_{s;\omega_{j_1},\ldots,\omega_{j_{k-1}}}\|_2^2\\&=\int_{[0,1]^k}\left|\left[\frac{\frac{\partial^{n-1}}{\partial u^{n-1}}f_{u;\omega_{j_1},\ldots,\omega_{j_{k-1}}}(\boldsymbol{\tau})}{(-\mathrm{i}2\pi s)^{n-1}}e^{-\mathrm{i}s2\pi u}\right]_0^1-\int_0^1\frac{e^{-\mathrm{i}s2\pi u}}{(-\mathrm{i}2\pi s)^n}\frac{\partial^n}{\partial u^n}f_{u;\omega_{j_1},\ldots,\omega_{j_{k-1}}}(\boldsymbol{\tau})du\right|^2d\boldsymbol{\tau}\\&=\int_{[0,1]^{k+2}}\frac{1}{(2\pi s)^{2n}}e^{\mathrm{i}2\pi s(u-v)}\frac{\partial^2}{\partial u^2}f_{u;\omega_{j_1},\ldots,\omega_{j_{k-1}}}(\boldsymbol{\tau})\frac{\partial^2}{\partial v^2}f_{v;\omega_{j_1},\ldots,\omega_{j_{k-1}}}(\boldsymbol{\tau})d\boldsymbol{\tau}dudv\\&\leqslant\frac{1}{(2\pi s)^{2n}}\int_{[0,1]^{k+2}}\left|\frac{\partial^2}{\partial u^2}f_{u;\omega_{j_1},\ldots,\omega_{j_{k-1}}}(\boldsymbol{\tau})\frac{\partial^2}{\partial v^2}f_{v;\omega_{j_1},\ldots,\omega_{j_{k-1}}}(\boldsymbol{\tau})\right|d\boldsymbol{\tau}dudv\\&\leqslant\frac{1}{(2\pi s)^{2n}}\int_{[0,1]^2}\left\|\frac{\partial^2}{\partial u^2}f_{u;\omega_{j_1},\ldots,\omega_{j_{k-1}}}\right\|_2\left\|\frac{\partial^2}{\partial v^2}f_{v;\omega_{j_1},\ldots,\omega_{j_{k-1}}}\right\|_2dudv\\&\leqslant\frac{1}{(2\pi s)^{2n}}\left(\sup_u\left\|\frac{\partial^2}{\partial u^2}f_{u;\omega_{j_1},\ldots,\omega_{j_{k-1}}}\right\|_2\right)^2<\infty,\end{aligned}$$

where the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality was applied in the second-to-last equality. The interchange of integrals is justified by Fubini's theorem. Thus,

$$\sup_{\omega_1,..,\omega_{k-1}} \|\tilde{f}_{s;\omega_{j_1},...,\omega_{j_{k-1}}}\|_2 \leqslant \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{2n}} \sup_{u,\omega_1,...,\omega_n} \left\| \frac{\partial^n}{\partial u^n} f_{u;\omega_{j_1},...,\omega_{j_{k-1}}} \right\|_2 |s|^{-n}. \tag{S1.4}$$

and (A.6) follows from Assumption 4.3 (iv). □

Proof of Corollary A.1. For completeness, we elaborate on part (ii) of the corollary. Note that

$$\|\!|\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{0:\omega}|\!\|_2 \leqslant \sup_{\omega,u} \|\!|\mathcal{F}_{u,\omega}|\!\|_2 < \sum_h \|\kappa_{2,h}\|_2 < \infty.$$

The p-harmonic series for $p = 2$ then yields

$$\sup_{\omega} \sum_{s\in\mathbb{Z}} \|\!|\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{s;\omega}|\!\|_2 \leqslant \sum_h \|\kappa_{2,h}\|_2 \left(1 + \frac{1}{(2\pi)^4}\frac{\pi^2}{3}\right) < \infty, \tag{S1.5}$$

where the constant $(2\pi)^{-4}$ follows from (S1.4). □

S2 Error bound for the denominator of the test statistic

A bound needs to be obtained on the error resulting from the replacement of the unknown spectral operators with consistent estimators. It will be sufficient to consider a bound on

$$\sqrt{T}|\gamma_h^{(T)}(l_1,l_2) - \hat{\gamma}_h^{(T)}(l_1,l_2)|$$

for all $l_1, l_2 \in \mathbb{N}$, where $\gamma^{(T)}$ is defined in equation (3.1) of the main paper. Consider the function $g(x) = x^{-1/2}$, $x > 0$, and notice that

$$\gamma_h^{(T)}(l_1,l_2) - \hat{\gamma}_h^{(T)}(l_1,l_2) = \frac{1}{T}\sum_{j=1}^{T} D_{\omega_j}^{(l_1)} D_{-\omega_{j+h}}^{(l_2)} \Big[g(\mathcal{F}_{\omega_j}^{(l_1,l_1)}\mathcal{F}_{\omega_{j+h}}^{(l_2,l_2)}) - g(\hat{\mathcal{F}}_{\omega_j}^{(l_1,l_1)}\hat{\mathcal{F}}_{\omega_{j+h}}^{(l_2,l_2)}) \Big].$$

Given the assumption $\inf_\omega \langle \mathcal{F}_\omega(\psi), \psi\rangle > 0$ for all $\psi \in H$ is satisfied, continuity of the inner product implies that for fixed l_1, l_2 the mean value theorem may be applied to find

$$\begin{aligned}
&\gamma_h^{(T)}(l_1,l_2) - \hat{\gamma}_h^{(T)}(l_1,l_2) \\
&\qquad = \frac{1}{T}\sum_{j=1}^{T} D_{\omega_j}^{(l_1)} D_{-\omega_{j+h}}^{(l_2)} \left[\frac{\partial g(x)}{\partial x}\Big|_{x=\breve{\mathcal{F}}_{\omega_j}^{(l_1,l_1)}\breve{\mathcal{F}}_{\omega_{j+h}}^{(l_2,l_2)}} \big(\hat{\mathcal{F}}_{\omega_j}^{(l_1,l_1)}\hat{\mathcal{F}}_{\omega_{j+h}}^{(l_2,l_2)} - \mathcal{F}_{\omega_j}^{(l_1,l_1)}\mathcal{F}_{\omega_{j+h}}^{(l_2,l_2)}\big) \right],
\end{aligned}$$

where $\breve{\mathcal{F}}_{\omega_j}^{(l_1,l_1)}\breve{\mathcal{F}}_{\omega_{j+h}}^{(l_2,l_2)}$ lies in between $\hat{\mathcal{F}}_{\omega_j}^{(l_1,l_1)}\hat{\mathcal{F}}_{\omega_{j+h}}^{(l_2,l_2)}$ and $\mathcal{F}_{\omega_j}^{(l_1,l_1)}\mathcal{F}_{\omega_{j+h}}^{(l_2,l_2)}$. Because of uniform convergence of $\hat{\mathcal{F}}_{\omega_j} \in S_2(H)$ with respect to ω, it follows that

$$\sqrt{T}|\gamma_h^{(T)}(l_1,l_2) - \hat{\gamma}_h^{(T)}(l_1,l_2)| = O_p(1)\left|\frac{1}{T}\sum_{j=1}^{T} \frac{D_{\omega_j}^{(l_1)} D_{-\omega_{j+h}}^{(l_2)}}{(\mathcal{F}_{\omega_j}^{(l_1,l_1)}\mathcal{F}_{\omega_{j+h}}^{(l_2,l_2)})^{3/2}} \big(\hat{\mathcal{F}}_{\omega_j}^{(l_1,l_1)}\hat{\mathcal{F}}_{\omega_{j+h}}^{(l_2,l_2)} - \mathcal{F}_{\omega_j}^{(l_1,l_1)}\mathcal{F}_{\omega_{j+h}}^{(l_2,l_2)}\big)\right|. \tag{S2.1}$$

With these preliminary results at hand, the first main theorems can be verified.

Proof of Theorems 4.1 and 4.5. In order to prove both theorems, partition (S2.1) as follows

$$J_1(l,l_2) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{j=1}^{T} \frac{D_{\omega_j}^{(l_1)} D_{-\omega_{j+h}}^{(l_2)} - \mathbb{E}[D_{\omega_j}^{(l_1)} D_{-\omega_{j+h}}^{(l_2)}]}{(\mathcal{F}_{\omega_j}^{(l_1,l_1)} \mathcal{F}_{\omega_{j+h}}^{(l_2,l_2)})^{3/2}} \hat{\mathcal{F}}_{\omega_j}^{(l_1,l_1)} \big(\hat{\mathcal{F}}_{\omega_{j+h}}^{(l_2,l_2)} - \mathcal{F}_{\omega_{j+h}}^{(l_2,l_2)}\big), \tag{S2.2}$$

$$J_2(l,l_2) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{j=1}^{T} \frac{D_{\omega_j}^{(l_1)} D_{-\omega_{j+h}}^{(l_2)} - \mathbb{E}[D_{\omega_j}^{(l_1)} D_{-\omega_{j+h}}^{(l_2)}]}{(\mathcal{F}_{\omega_j}^{(l_1,l_1)} \mathcal{F}_{\omega_{j+h}}^{(l_2,l_2)})^{3/2}} \mathcal{F}_{\omega_{j+h}}^{(l_2,l_2)} \big(\hat{\mathcal{F}}_{\omega_j}^{(l_1,l_1)} - \mathcal{F}_{\omega_j}^{(l_1,l_1)}\big), \tag{S2.3}$$

$$J_3(l,l_2) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{j=1}^{T} \frac{\mathbb{E}[D_{\omega_j}^{(l_1)} D_{-\omega_{j+h}}^{(l_2)}]}{(\mathcal{F}_{\omega_j}^{(l_1,l_1)} \mathcal{F}_{\omega_{j+h}}^{(l_2,l_2)})^{3/2}} \big(\hat{\mathcal{F}}_{\omega_j}^{(l_1,l_1)} \hat{\mathcal{F}}_{\omega_{j+h}}^{(l_2,l_2)} - \mathbb{E}[\hat{\mathcal{F}}_{\omega_j}^{(l_1,l_1)} \hat{\mathcal{F}}_{\omega_{j+h}}^{(l_2,l_2)}]\big), \tag{S2.4}$$

$$J_4(l,l_2) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{j=1}^{T} \frac{\mathbb{E}[D_{\omega_j}^{(l_1)} D_{-\omega_{j+h}}^{(l_2)}]}{(\mathcal{F}_{\omega_j}^{(l_1,l_1)} \mathcal{F}_{\omega_{j+h}}^{(l_2,l_2)})^{3/2}} \big(\mathbb{E}[\hat{\mathcal{F}}_{\omega_j}^{(l_1,l_1)} \hat{\mathcal{F}}_{\omega_{j+h}}^{(l_2,l_2)}] - \mathcal{F}_{\omega_j}^{(l_1,l_1)} \mathcal{F}_{\omega_{j+h}}^{(l_2,l_2)}\big). \tag{S2.5}$$

The proof of both theorems are based on Corollary S2.1 and Lemmas S2.1-S2.4 below. These results together with an application of the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality yield

(i) $|J_1| = O_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{bT}} + b^2\right)$,

(ii) $|J_2| = \begin{cases} O_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{bT}} + \frac{b^2}{\sqrt{T}}\right) & \text{under Assumption 4.1,} \\ O_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{bT}} + b^2\right) & \text{under Assumption 4.3,} \end{cases}$

(iii) $|J_3| = \begin{cases} O_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{bT}}\right) & \text{under Assumption 4.1,} \\ O_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{bT}}\right) & \text{under Assumption 4.3,} \end{cases}$

(iv) $|J_4| = \begin{cases} O\left(b^2 + \frac{1}{bT}\right) & \text{under Assumption 4.1.} \\ O\left(\sqrt{T}b^2 + \frac{1}{b\sqrt{T}}\right) & \text{under Assumption 4.3.} \end{cases}$

Minkowski's Inequality then gives the result. □

Corollary S2.1. *Under Assumption 4.1*

$$\mathbb{E}\big[\|\hat{\mathcal{F}}_{\omega}^{(T)} - \mathcal{F}_{\omega}\|_2^2\big] = O\left(\frac{1}{bT} + b^4\right) \qquad (T \to \infty), \tag{S2.6}$$

while, under Assumption 4.3,

$$\mathbb{E}\big[\|\hat{\mathcal{F}}_{\omega}^{(T)} - G_{\omega}\|_2^2\big] = O\left(\frac{1}{bT} + b^4\right) \qquad (T \to \infty). \tag{S2.7}$$

Proof. See Panaretos & Tavakoli (2013, Theorem 3.6) and Theorem 4.4, respectively. □

Lemma S2.1. *Let $(g_j^{(l_1,l_2)} : j \in \mathbb{Z})$ be a bounded sequence in $\mathbb{C}$ for all $l_1, l_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\inf_j g_j^{(l_1,l_2)} > 0$. Under Assumption 4.1 and under Assumption 4.3,*

$$\mathbb{E}\Big[\Big|\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}\sum_{j=1}^{T} g_j^{(l_1,l_2)}\big(D_{\omega_j}^{(l_1)}D_{-\omega_{j+h}}^{(l_2)} - \mathbb{E}\big[D_{\omega_j}^{(l_1)}D_{-\omega_{j+h}}^{(l_2)}\big]\big)\hat{\mathcal{F}}_{\omega_j}^{(l_1,l_1)}\Big|^2\Big] = O(1).$$

Proof. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\Big[\Big|\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}\sum_{j=1}^{T} g_j^{(l_1,l_2)}\big(D_{\omega_j}^{(l_1)}D_{-\omega_{j+h}}^{(l_2)} - \mathbb{E}\big[D_{\omega_j}^{(l_1)}D_{-\omega_{j+h}}^{(l_2)}\big]\big)\hat{\mathcal{F}}_{\omega_j}^{(l_1,l_1)}\Big|^2\Big] \\
&= \mathbb{E}\Big[\Big|\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}\sum_{j=1}^{T} g_j^{(l_1,l_2)}\big(D_{\omega_j}^{(l_1)}D_{-\omega_{j+h}}^{(l_2)} - E\big[D_{\omega_j}^{(l_1)}D_{-\omega_{j+h}}^{(l_2)}\big]\big)\frac{2\pi}{bT}\sum_{j'=1}^{T} K\Big(\frac{\omega_{j'}}{b}\Big)D_{\omega_{j-j'}}^{(l_1)}D_{\omega_{j'-j}}^{(l_1)}\Big|^2\Big] \\
&= \frac{1}{T}\Big(\frac{2\pi}{bT}\Big)^2\sum_{j_1,j_2=1}^{T} g_{j_1,j_2}^{(l_1,l_2)}\sum_{j_1',j_2'=1}^{T} K\Big(\frac{\omega_{j_1'}}{b}\Big)K\Big(\frac{\omega_{j_2'}}{b}\Big)\mathbb{E}\Big[\big\{\big(D_{\omega_{j_1}}^{(l_1)}D_{-\omega_{j_1+h}}^{(l_2)} - \mathbb{E}\big[D_{\omega_{j_1}}^{(l_1)}D_{-\omega_{j_1+h}}^{(l_2)}\big]\big) \\
&\quad \times D_{\omega_{j_1-j_1'}}^{(l_1)}D_{\omega_{j_1'-j_1}}^{(l_1)}\big\}\big\{\big(D_{-\omega_{j_2}}^{(l_1)}D_{\omega_{j_2+h}}^{(l_2)} - \mathbb{E}\big[D_{-\omega_{j_2}}^{(l_1)}D_{\omega_{j_2+h}}^{(l_2)}\big]\big)D_{\omega_{j_2'-j_2}}^{(l_1)}D_{\omega_{j_2-j_2'}}^{(l_1)}\big\}\Big].
\end{aligned}$$

Expanding the expectation in terms of cumulants, one obtains the structure

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}[(X-\mathbb{E}X)Y][(W-EW)Z] \\
&\quad = E[XYWZ] - E[W]E[XYZ] - E[YWZ[E[X] + E[W]E[X]E[YZ] \\
&\quad = \mathrm{cum}(X,Y,W,Z) + \mathrm{cum}(X,Y,W)\mathrm{cum}(Z) + \mathrm{cum}(X,W,Z)\mathrm{cum}(Y) \\
&\qquad + \mathrm{cum}(X,Y)\mathrm{cum}(W,Z) + \mathrm{cum}(X,W)\mathrm{cum}(Y,Z) + \mathrm{cum}(X,Z)\mathrm{cum}(Y,W),
\end{aligned}$$

where X, Y, W, Z are products of random elements of H. Hence, by the product theorem for cumulants, only those products of cumulants have to be considered that lead to indecomposable partitions of the matrix below or of any sub-matrix (with the same column structure) with the exception that (Y) or (Z) is allowed to be decomposable but not within the same partition.

$$\begin{array}{llll}
(X) & D_{\omega_{j_1}}^{(l_1)} & D_{-\omega_{j_1+h}}^{(l_2)} & \\
(Y) & D_{\omega_{j_1-j_1'}}^{(l_1)} & D_{\omega_{j_1'-j_1}}^{(l_1)} & \\
(W) & D_{-\omega_{j_2}}^{(l_1)} & D_{\omega_{j_2+h}}^{(l_2)} & \\
(Z) & D_{\omega_{j_2'-j_2}}^{(l_1)} & D_{\omega_{j_2-j_2'}}^{(l_1)} &
\end{array} \tag{S2.8}$$

That is, the order of the error belonging to those partitions has to be investigated for which the cumulant terms that contain an element of the sets $\{D_{\omega_{j_1}}^{(l_1)}, D_{-\omega_{j_1+h}}^{(l_2)}\}$ and of $\{D_{-\omega_{j_2}}^{(l_1)}D_{\omega_{j_2+h}}^{(l_2)}\}$ also contain at least one element from another set. Because the process has zero-mean, it suffices consider partitions for which $m_i \geqslant 2$. By Lemma A.1 of the main paper, a cumulant of order k upscaled by order T will be of order $O(T^{-k/2+1})$ under H_0 and $O(T^{-k/2+2})$ under the alternative. This directly implies that only terms of the following form have to

be investigated:

$$\frac{1}{T}\Big(\frac{2\pi}{bT}\Big)^2 \sum_{j_1,j_2=1}^{T} \sum_{j_1',j_2'=1}^{T} K\Big(\frac{\omega_{j_1'}}{b}\Big)K\Big(\frac{\omega_{j_2'}}{b}\Big)\mathrm{cum}_4\mathrm{cum}_2\mathrm{cum}_2, \tag{S2.9}$$

$$\frac{1}{T}\Big(\frac{2\pi}{bT}\Big)^2 \sum_{j_1,j_2=1}^{T} \sum_{j_1',j_2'=1}^{T} K\Big(\frac{\omega_{j_1'}}{b}\Big)K\Big(\frac{\omega_{j_2'}}{b}\Big)\mathrm{cum}_3\mathrm{cum}_3\mathrm{cum}_2, \tag{S2.10}$$

$$\frac{1}{T}\Big(\frac{2\pi}{bT}\Big)^2 \sum_{j_1,j_2=1}^{T} \sum_{j_1',j_2'=1}^{T} K\Big(\frac{\omega_{j_1'}}{b}\Big)K\Big(\frac{\omega_{j_2'}}{b}\Big)\mathrm{cum}_2\mathrm{cum}_2\mathrm{cum}_2\mathrm{cum}_2. \tag{S2.11}$$

However, for a fixed partition $P = \{P_1, \ldots, P_M\}$,

$$T\prod_{j=1}^{M} O\Big(\frac{1}{T^{m_j/2-1}}\Big),$$

from which it is also clear that (S2.9) and (S2.10) are at most going to be of order $O(1)$ under the alternative and of lower order under H_0. The term (S2.11) could possibly of order $O(T)$. Further analysis can therefore be restricted to partitions of this form. As mentioned above, partitions in which a term contains an element of the sets $\{D^{(l_1)}_{\omega_{j_1}}, D^{(l_2)}_{-\omega_{j_1+h}}\}$ and of $\{D^{(l_1)}_{-\omega_{j_2}} D^{(l_2)}_{\omega_{j_2+h}}\}$ must contain at least one element from another set. It follows that partitions in which $m_i = 2$ for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, M\}$, without any restrictions on the summations, are decomposable. We find the term of highest order is thus of the type

$$\frac{1}{T}\sum_{j_1,j_2=1}^{T} g^{(l_1,l_2)}_{j_1,j_2}\Big(\frac{2\pi}{bT}\Big)^2 \sum_{j_1',j_2'=1}^{T} K\Big(\frac{\omega_{j_1'}}{b}\Big)K\Big(\frac{\omega_{j_2'}}{b}\Big)\mathrm{cum}\big(D^{(l_2)}_{-\omega_{j_1+h}}, D^{(l_2)}_{\omega_{j_2+h}}\big)\mathrm{cum}\big(D^{(l_1)}_{-\omega_{j_2}}, D^{(l_1)}_{\omega_{j_1}}\big)$$
$$\times\, \mathrm{cum}\big(D^{(l_1)}_{\omega_{j_1-j_1'}} D^{(l_1)}_{\omega_{j_1-j_1'}}\big)\mathrm{cum}\big(D^{(l_1)}_{\omega_{j_2'-j_2}} D^{(l_1)}_{\omega_{j_2-j_2'}}\big) = \sup_j g_j^{2(l_1,l_2)} O(TT^{-1}) = O(1),$$

under the null of stationarity and under the alternative, where the error is uniform in ω. The bound in case of the alternative follows from Corollary A.1 of the main paper. The result follows since, by the positive definiteness of the spectral density operators, $\sup_j |g_j^{(l_1,l_2)}| < \infty$ for all $l_1, l_2 \in \mathbb{N}$. □

Lemma S2.2. *Let* $(g_j^{(l_1,l_2)} : j \in \mathbb{Z})$ *be a bounded sequence in* $\mathbb{C}$ *for all* $l_1, l_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ *such that* $\inf_{l_1,l_2} g_j^{(l_1,l_2)} > 0$. *Then,*

$$E\Big[\Big|\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}\sum_{j=1}^{T} g_j^{(l_1,l_2)}\big(D^{(l_1)}_{\omega_j} D^{(l_2)}_{-\omega_{j+h}} - \mathbb{E}\big[D^{(l_1)}_{\omega_j} D^{(l_2)}_{-\omega_{j+h}}\big]\big)\Big|^2\Big] = \begin{cases} O\Big(\frac{1}{T}\Big) & \textit{under } H_0. \\ O(1) & \textit{under } H_1. \end{cases}$$

Proof. Notice that

$$E\Big[\Big|\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}\sum_{j=1}^{T} g_j^{(l_1,l_2)}\big(D^{(l_1)}_{\omega_j} D^{(l_2)}_{-\omega_{j+h}} - \mathbb{E}\big[D^{(l_1)}_{\omega_j} D^{(l_2)}_{-\omega_{j+h}}\big]\big)\Big|^2\Big]$$
$$= \frac{1}{T}\sum_{j_1,j_2=1}^{T}\Big(g^{(l_1,l_2)}_{j_1,j_2}\mathbb{E}\big[D^{(l_1)}_{\omega_{j_1}} D^{(l_2)}_{-\omega_{j_1+h}} D^{(l_1)}_{-\omega_{j_2}} D^{(l_2)}_{\omega_{j_2+h}}\big] - \mathbb{E}\big[D^{(l_1)}_{\omega_{j_1}} D^{(l_2)}_{-\omega_{j_1+h}}\big]\mathbb{E}\big[D^{(l_1)}_{-\omega_{j_2}} D^{(l_2)}_{\omega_{j_2+h}}\big]\Big)$$

$$= \frac{1}{T}\sum_{j_1,j_2=1}^{T}\Big(g_{j_1,j_2}^{(l_1,l_2)}\mathrm{cum}\big(D_{\omega_{j_1}}^{(l_1)}, D_{-\omega_{j_1+h}}^{(l_2)}, D_{-\omega_{j_2}}^{(l_1)} D_{\omega_{j_2+h}}^{(l_2)}\big) + \\ \mathrm{cum}\big(D_{\omega_{j_1}}^{(l_1)}, D_{-\omega_{j_2}}^{(l_1)}\big)\mathrm{cum}\big(D_{-\omega_{j_1+h}}^{(l_2)}, D_{\omega_{j_2+h}}^{(l_2)}\big) + \mathrm{cum}\big(D_{\omega_{j_1}}^{(l_1)}, D_{\omega_{j_2+h}}^{(l_2)}\big)\mathrm{cum}\big(D_{-\omega_{j_1+h}}^{(l_2)}, D_{-\omega_{j_2}}^{(l_1)}\big)\Big).$$

Under the null, this is therefore of the order $O(T/T^2 + 1/T) = O(1/T)$, where is uniform over ω. Under the alternative, by Corrolary A.1 of the main paper, the last term can be estimated by

$$\frac{1}{T}\sum_{j_1,j_2=1}^{T} g_{j_1,j_2}^{(l_1,l_2)}\Bigg(\frac{1}{T}G_{\omega_{j_1},-\omega_{j_1+h},-\omega_{j_2}}^{(l_1\,l_2,l_1\,l_2)} + \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{j_1-j_2;\omega_{j_1}}^{(l_1,l_1)}\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{-j_1+j_2;-\omega_{j_1+h}}^{(l_2,l_2)} \\ + \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{j_1+j_2+h;\omega_{j_1}}^{(l_1,l_2)}\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{-j_1-j_2-h;-\omega_{j_1+h}}^{(l_2,l_1)} + O\Big(\frac{1}{T}\Big)\Bigg)$$

$$\leqslant \sup_j |g_j^{(l_1,l_2)}|^2 \frac{1}{T}\sum_{j_1,j_2=1}^{T}\Bigg(\frac{1}{T}G_{\omega_{j_1},-\omega_{j_1+h},-\omega_{j_2}}^{(l_1\,l_2,l_1\,l_2)} + \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{j_1-j_2;\omega_{j_1}}^{(l_1,l_1)}\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{-j_1+j_2;-\omega_{j_1+h}}^{(l_2,l_2)} \\ + \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{j_1+j_2+h;\omega_{j_1}}^{(l_1,l_2)}\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{-j_1-j_2-h;-\omega_{j_1+h}}^{(l_2,l_1)} + O\Big(\frac{1}{T}\Big)\Bigg)$$

$$\leqslant \sup_j |g_j^{(l_1,l_2)}|^2\Bigg(\sum_{t_1,t_2,t_3}\|\kappa_{4;t_1,t_2,t_3}\|_2\|\psi_{l_1}\|_2^2|\psi_{l_2}\|_2^2 + C\sum_t\|\kappa_{2;t}\|_2\Bigg) = O(1),$$

for some constant C. □

Lemma S2.3. *Let* $(g_j^{(l_1,l_2)} : j \in \mathbb{Z})$ *be a bounded sequence in* $\mathbb{C}$ *for all* $l_1, l_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ *such that* $\inf_{l_1,l_2} g_j^{(l_1,l_2)} > 0$. *Then,*

$$\mathbb{E}\Bigg[\Bigg|\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}\sum_{j=1}^{T} g_j^{(l_1,l_2)}\mathbb{E}\big[D_{\omega_j}^{(l_1)}D_{-\omega_{j+h}}^{(l_2)}\big]\Big(\hat{\mathcal{F}}_{\omega_j}^{(l_1,l_1)}\hat{\mathcal{F}}_{\omega_{j+h}}^{(l_2,l_2)} - \mathbb{E}\big[\hat{\mathcal{F}}_{\omega_j}^{(l_1,l_1)}\hat{\mathcal{F}}_{\omega_{j+h}}^{(l_2,l_2)}\big]\Big)\Bigg|\Bigg] \\ = \begin{cases} O\Big(\dfrac{1}{\sqrt{bT}}\Big) & \textit{under Assumption 4.1.} \\ O\Big(\dfrac{1}{\sqrt{bT}}\Big) & \textit{under Assumption 4.3.} \end{cases}$$

Proof. Observe first that by the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality,

$$\mathbb{E}[|J_3(l_1,l_2)|] \leqslant \sup_j\big|g_j^{(l_1,l_2)}\mathbb{E}\big[D_{\omega_j}^{(l_1)}D_{-\omega_{j+h}}^{(l_2)}\big]\big| \\ \times\Bigg(\mathbb{E}\Bigg[\Bigg|\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}\sum_{j=1}^{T}\big(\hat{\mathcal{F}}_{\omega_j}^{(l_1,l_1)}\hat{\mathcal{F}}_{\omega_{j+h}}^{(l_2,l_2)} - \mathbb{E}\big[\hat{\mathcal{F}}_{\omega_j}^{(l_1,l_1)}\hat{\mathcal{F}}_{\omega_{j+h}}^{(l_2,l_2)}\big]\big)\Bigg|^2\Bigg]\Bigg)^{1/2},$$

which follows because the term over which the supremum is taken is deterministic. In particular, it is of order $O(T^{-1})$ under the null and $O(h^{-2})$ under the alternative. To find a bound on

$$\mathbb{E}\Bigg[\Bigg|\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}\sum_{j=1}^{T}\big(\hat{\mathcal{F}}_{\omega_j}^{(l_1,l_1)}\hat{\mathcal{F}}_{\omega_{j+h}}^{(l_2,l_2)} - \mathbb{E}\big[\hat{\mathcal{F}}_{\omega_j}^{(l_1,l_1)}\hat{\mathcal{F}}_{\omega_{j+h}}^{(l_2,l_2)}\big]\big)\Bigg|^2\Bigg],$$

we proceed similarly as in the proof of Lemma S2.1. Observe that,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\Big[\Big|\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}\sum_{j=1}^{T}\big(\hat{\mathcal{F}}^{(l_1,l_1)}_{\omega_j}\hat{\mathcal{F}}^{(l_2,l_2)}_{\omega_{j+h}}-\mathbb{E}\hat{\mathcal{F}}^{(l_1,l_1)}_{\omega_j}\hat{\mathcal{F}}^{(l_2,l_2)}_{\omega_{j+h}}\big)\Big|^2\Big]\\
=&\frac{1}{T}\Big(\frac{2\pi}{bT}\Big)^2\sum_{j_1,j_2=1}^{T}\sum_{j_1',j_2',j_3',j_4'=1}^{T}\prod_{i=1}^{4}K\Big(\frac{\omega_{j_i'}}{b}\Big)\\
&\times\mathbb{E}\Big[\big(D^{(l_1)}_{\omega_{j_1-j_1'}}D^{(l_1)}_{\omega_{j_1'-j_1}}D^{(l_2)}_{\omega_{j_1+h-j_2'}}D^{(l_2)}_{\omega_{j_2'-j_1-h}}-E[D^{(l_1)}_{\omega_{j_1-j_1'}}D^{(l_1)}_{\omega_{j_1'-j_1}}D^{(l_2)}_{\omega_{j_1+h-j_2'}}D^{(l_2)}_{\omega_{j_2'-j_1-h}}]\big)\\
&\times\big(D^{(l_1)}_{\omega_{j_3'-j_2}}D^{(l_1)}_{\omega_{j_2-j_3'}}D^{(l_2)}_{\omega_{j_4'-j_2-h}}D^{(l_2)}_{\omega_{j_2+h-j_4'}}-\mathbb{E}[D^{(l_1)}_{\omega_{j_3'-j_2}}D^{(l_1)}_{\omega_{j_2-j_3'}}D^{(l_2)}_{\omega_{j_4'-j_2-h}}D^{(l_2)}_{\omega_{j_2+h-j_4'}}]\big)\Big].
\end{aligned}$$

Write

$$\mathbb{E}[(X-\mathbb{E}X)][(Y-EY)]=\mathrm{cum}(X,Y)-\mathrm{cum}(X)\mathrm{cum}(Y)$$

for products X, W of random elements of H. When expanding this in terms of cumulants, we only have to consider those products of cumulants that lead to indecomposable partitions of the rows of the matrix below

$$\begin{array}{ll}(X) & D^{(l_1)}_{\omega_{j_1-j_1'}}\ D^{(l_1)}_{\omega_{j_1'-j_1}}\ D^{(l_2)}_{\omega_{j_1+h-j_2'}}\ D^{(l_2)}_{\omega_{j_2'-j_1-h}}\\ (Y) & D^{(l_1)}_{\omega_{j_3'-j_2}}\ D^{(l_1)}_{\omega_{j_2-j_3'}}\ D^{(l_2)}_{\omega_{j_4'-j_2-h}}\ D^{(l_2)}_{\omega_{j_2+h-j_4'}}\end{array}\tag{S2.12}$$

In order to satisfy this, in every partition there must be at least one term that contains both an element of X and of Y. A similar reasoning as in the proof of S2.1 indicates we will only have to consider partitions where $2\leqslant m_i\leqslant 4$ for $i=1,\ldots,M$. In case of stationarity we only have to consider those with $m_i=2$ for all $i=1,\ldots,M$. In both cases at least one restriction in terms of the summation must occur in order for the partition to be decomposable. In particular, it can be verified that the partition of highest order is of the form

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{T}\sum_{j_1,j_2=1}^{T}\Big(\frac{2\pi}{bT}\Big)^4\sum_{j_1',j_2',j_3',j_4'=1}^{T}\prod_{i=1}^{4}K\Big(\frac{\omega_{j_i'}}{b}\Big)\mathrm{cum}(D^{(l_2)}_{\omega_{j_4'-j_2-h}}D^{(l_2)}_{\omega_{j_2+h-j_4'}})\mathrm{cum}(D^{(l_2)}_{\omega_{j_1+h-j_2'}}D^{(l_2)}_{\omega_{j_2'-j_1-h}})\\
&\qquad\times\mathrm{cum}(D^{(l_1)}_{\omega_{j_1-j_1'}},D^{(l_1)}_{\omega_{j_3'-j_2}})\mathrm{cum}(D^{(l_1)}_{\omega_{j_1'-j_1}},D^{(l_1)}_{\omega_{j_2-j_3'}})\\
&=\frac{1}{T}\sum_{j_1,j_2=1}^{T}\Big(\frac{2\pi}{bT}\Big)^4\sum_{j_1',j_2',j_3',j_4'=1}^{T}\prod_{i=1}^{4}K\Big(\frac{\omega_{j_i'}}{b}\Big)\Big[\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{(l_2,l_2)}_{0;\omega_{-j_2+h-j_4'}}+O\Big(\frac{1}{T}\Big)\Big]\Big[\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{(l_2,l_2)}_{0;\omega_{j_1-j_2'+h}}O\Big(\frac{1}{T}\Big)\Big]\\
&\qquad\times\Big[\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{(l_1,l_1)}_{j_1-j_2-j_1'+j_3';\omega_{j_1-j_1'}}+O\Big(\frac{1}{T}\Big)\Big]\Big[\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{(l_1,l_1)}_{j_2-j_1-j_3'+j_1';\omega_{j_1'-j_1}}+O\Big(\frac{1}{T}\Big)\Big]\\
&\leqslant C\frac{1}{bT}\sup_{\omega}|G^{2(l_2,l_2)}_{\omega}|\frac{1}{T}\sum_{j_1,j_2=1}^{T}\Big[\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{(l_1,l_1)}_{j_1-j_2;\omega_{j_1-j_1'}}+O\Big(\frac{1}{T}\Big)\Big]\Big[\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{(l_1,l_1)}_{j_2-j_1;\omega_{j_1'-j_1}}+O\Big(\frac{1}{T}\Big)\Big]=O\Big(\frac{1}{bT}\Big),
\end{aligned}$$

since $\|\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{j_1-j_2-j_1'+j_3';\omega_{j_1-j_1'}}\|_2\leqslant C|j_1-j_2-j_1'+j_3'|^{-2}$ and $\|K(x/b)\|_\infty=O(1)$, where the bandwidth leads to only bT nonzero terms in the summation over j_1. The same bound can be shown to hold under stationarity. As before, the error is uniform with respect to ω which follows again from Corollary A.1 of the main paper. □

Lemma S2.4. *Let $(g_j^{(l_1,l_2)} : j \in \mathbb{Z})$ be a bounded sequence in $\mathbb{C}$ for all $l_1, l_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\inf_{l_1,l_2} g_j^{(l_1,l_2)} > 0$. Then,*

$$\left|\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}\sum_{j=1}^{T} g_j^{(l_1,l_2)}\mathbb{E}\big[D_{\omega_j}^{(l_1)}D_{-\omega_{j+h}}^{(l_2)}\big]\big(\mathbb{E}\big[\hat{\mathcal{F}}_{\omega_j}^{(l_1,l_1)}\hat{\mathcal{F}}_{\omega_{j+h}}^{(l_2,l_2)}\big] - \mathcal{F}_{\omega_j}^{(l_1,l_1)}\mathcal{F}_{\omega_{j+h}}^{(l_2,l_2)}\big)\right|$$
$$= \begin{cases} O\left(b^2 + \dfrac{1}{bT}\right) & \textit{under Assumption 4.1.} \\ O\left(\sqrt{T}b^2 + \dfrac{1}{b\sqrt{T}}\right) & \textit{under Assumption 4.3.} \end{cases}$$

Proof. First note that

$$\left|\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}\sum_{j=1}^{T} g_j^{(l_1,l_2)}\mathbb{E}\big[D_{\omega_j}^{(l_1)}D_{-\omega_{j+h}}^{(l_2)}\big]\right| = \begin{cases} O\left(\dfrac{1}{\sqrt{T}}\right) & \text{under Assumption 4.1.} \\ O(\sqrt{T}) & \text{under Assumption 4.3.} \end{cases}$$

Observe next that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\big[\hat{\mathcal{F}}_{\omega_j}^{(l_1,l_1)}\hat{\mathcal{F}}_{\omega_{j+h}}^{(l_2,l_2)}\big] - \mathcal{F}_{\omega_j}^{(l_1,l_1)}\mathcal{F}_{\omega_{j+h}}^{(l_2,l_2)} \\
&\quad= \left(\frac{2\pi}{bT}\right)^2 \sum_{j_1,j_2=1}^{T} K\left(\frac{\omega_{j_1}}{b}\right)K\left(\frac{\omega_{j_2}}{b}\right)\mathbb{E}\big[D_{\omega_{j-j_1}}^{(l_1)}D_{\omega_{j_1-j}}^{(l_1)}D_{\omega_{j+h-j_2}}^{(l_2)}D_{\omega_{j_2-j-h}}^{(l_2)}\big] - \mathcal{F}_{\omega_j}^{(l_1,l_1)}\mathcal{F}_{\omega_{j+h}}^{(l_2,l_2)} \\
&\quad= \left(\frac{2\pi}{bT}\right)^2 \sum_{j_1,j_2=1}^{T} K\left(\frac{\omega_{j_1}}{b}\right)K\left(\frac{\omega_{j_2}}{b}\right)\Big(\mathrm{cum}(D_{\omega_{j-j_1}}^{(l_1)}, D_{\omega_{j+h-j_2}}^{(l_2)})\mathrm{cum}(D_{\omega_{j_1-j}}^{(l_1)}, D_{\omega_{j_2-j-h}}^{(l_2)}) \\
&\quad+ \mathrm{cum}(D_{\omega_{j-j_1}}^{(l_1)}, D_{\omega_{j_2-j-h}}^{(l_2)})\mathrm{cum}(D_{\omega_{j_1-j}}^{(l_1)}, D_{\omega_{j+h-j_2}}^{(l_2)})\Big) + O\left(b^2 + \frac{1}{bT}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Here, it was used that $\mathbb{E}[|\hat{\mathcal{F}}_{\omega_j}^{(l_1,l_1)} - \mathcal{F}_{\omega_j}^{(l_1,l_1)}|] \leqslant \mathbb{E}[\|\hat{\mathcal{F}}_{\omega_j} - \mathcal{F}_{\omega_j}\|_2]\|\psi_{l_1}\|_2\|\psi_{l_1}\|_2 = O(b^2 + 1/bT)$ under H_0. The same bound holds under the alternative, where $\mathcal{F}_\omega$ is replaced with the integrated spectrum G_ω. Under the alternative, write

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left(\frac{2\pi}{bT}\right)^2 \sum_{j_1,j_2=1}^{T} K\left(\frac{\omega_{j_1}}{b}\right)K\left(\frac{\omega_{j_2}}{b}\right)\big(\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{j_2-j_1-h;\omega_{j-j_1}}^{(l_1,l_2)}\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{j_1+h-j_2;\omega_{j_1-j}}^{(l_1,l_2)} + \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{h-j_1-j_2;\omega_{j-j_1}}^{(l_1,l_2)}\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{j_1+j_2-h;\omega_{j_1-j}}^{(l_1,l_2)} \\
&\qquad + O\left(\frac{1}{T}\right) + O\left(b^2 + \frac{1}{bT}\right) = O\left(b^2 + \frac{1}{bT}\right)
\end{aligned}$$

where Corollary A.1 of the main paper was applied and where we used that the bandwidth leads to only bT nonzero terms in the summation. Under H_0, a similar argument shows that the term is of order $O(b^2 + 1/bT)$. The result now follows. □

S3 Convergence of finite-dimensional distributions

Theorem S3.1. *Let Lemma A.1 be satisfied for some finite $k \geqslant 3$. Then, for all $l_i, l_i' \in \mathbb{N}$ and $h_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $i = 1, \ldots, k$,*

$$\frac{1}{T^{k/2}}\mathrm{cum}\Big(w_{h_1}^{(T)}(\psi_{l_1 l_1'}), \ldots, w_{h_k}^{(T)}(\psi_{l_k l_k'})\Big) = o(1) \qquad (T \to \infty), \tag{S3.1}$$

where $w_h^{(T)}(\psi_{ll'}) = \langle w_h^{(T)}, \psi_{ll'}\rangle$ *and* $(\psi_{ll'} : l, l' \in \mathbb{N})$ *an orthonormal basis of* $L^2([0,1]^2, \mathbb{C})$

Proof. The proof is given in three parts, the first of which provides the outset, the second gives the arguments for the stationary case, while the third deals with the locally stationary situation.

(1) Preliminaries. Fix $\tau_1, \tau_2 \in [0,1]$ and $h = 1, \dots, T-1$. It will be shown that the finite-dimensional distributions of $(w_h^{(T)}(\tau_1, \tau_2) : T \in \mathbb{N})$ converge to a Gaussian distribution by proving that the higher order cumulants of the terms $\sqrt{T} w_h^{(T)}(\psi_{ll'}) = \sqrt{T}\langle w_h^{(T)}, \psi_{ll'}\rangle$ vanish asymptotically. To formulate this, consider an array of the form

$$\begin{matrix} (1,1) & (1,2) \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ (k,1) & (k,2) \end{matrix} \tag{S3.2}$$

and let the value $s = ii'$ correspond to entry (i, i'). For a partition $P = \{P_1, \dots, P_Q\}$, the elements of a set P_q will be denoted by $s_{q1}, \dots, s_{qm_q}$ where $|P_q| = m_q$ is the corresponding number of elements in P_q. Associate with entry s the frequency index $j_s = j_{ii'} = (-1)^{i'-1}(j_i + h_i^{i'-1})$, Fourier frequency $\lambda_{j_s} = \frac{2\pi j_s}{T}$ and the basis function index $v_s = v_{ii'} = l_i^{2-i'} l_i'^{i'-1}$ for $i = 1, \dots, k$ and $i' = 1, 2$. An application of the product theorem for cumulants yields

$$\begin{aligned} &\operatorname{cum}\Big(\sum_{j_1=1}^{T} D_{\omega_{j_1}}^{(l_1)} D_{-\omega_{j_1+h_1}}^{(l_1')}, \dots, \sum_{j_k=1}^{T} D_{\omega_{j_k}}^{(l_k)} D_{-\omega_{j_k+h_k}}^{((l_k')} \Big) \\ &\quad = \sum_{j_1,\dots,j_k} \sum_{i.p.} \operatorname{cum}(D_{\lambda_{j_s}}^{(v_s)} : s \in P_1) \cdots \operatorname{cum}(D_{\lambda_{j_s}}^{(v_s)} : s \in P_Q), \end{aligned}$$

where the summation extends over all indecomposable partitions $P = \{P_1, \dots, P_Q\}$ of (S3.2). Because X_t has zero-mean, the number of elements within each set must satisfy $m_q \geqslant 2$. To ease notation, write $D_{\omega_{j_k}}^{(l)} = \langle D_{\omega_{j_k}}^{(T)}, \psi_l\rangle$ and

$$(\mathcal{F}_{t/T;\lambda_{j_s}}^{(v_s)} : s \in P_q) = \big\langle f_{t/T;\lambda_{j_{q1}},\dots,\lambda_{j_{qm_q-1}}}, \otimes_{i'=1}^{m_q} \psi_{v_{s_{qi'}}} \big\rangle,$$

noting that the latter quantity is well-defined. An application of Lemma A.1 of the main paper yields

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{i.p.} \prod_{q=1}^{Q} \operatorname{cum}\big(D_{\lambda_{j_s}}^{(v_s)} : s \in P_q\big) \\ &\quad = \sum_{i.p.} \prod_{q=1}^{Q} \Bigg[\frac{(2\pi)^{m_q/2-1}}{T^{m_q/2}} \Bigg(\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathcal{F}_{t/T;\lambda_{j_s}}^{(v_s)} e^{-\mathrm{i}\sum_s t\lambda_{j_s}} : s \in P_q \Bigg) + O\Bigg(\frac{1}{T^{m_q/2}} \Bigg) \Bigg], \end{aligned} \tag{S3.3}$$

where under the null $\mathcal{F}_{t/T;\lambda_{j_s}}^{(v_s)} = \mathcal{F}_{\lambda_{j_s}}^{(v_s)}$. In the following, the proof is separated into the cases where the true process is stationary and where it is locally stationary.

(2) Proof under stationarity. Recall that $\sup_{\boldsymbol{\omega}} \|\!| \mathcal{F}_{\omega_{j_1},\dots,\omega_{j_{k'-1}}} |\!\|_2 < \infty$ for all $k' \leqslant k$, and thus, by the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, $\sup_{\boldsymbol{\omega}} |\mathcal{F}_{\lambda_{j_s}}^{(v_s)}| < \infty$ for $s \in P_q$ and $q = 1, \dots, Q$. Therefore,

$$\sum_{i.p.} \prod_{q=1}^{Q} \operatorname{cum}(D_{\lambda_{j_s}}^{(v_s)} : s \in P_q)$$

$$\leqslant \sum_{i.p.}\prod_{q=1}^{Q}\Big[\frac{(2\pi)^{m_q/2-1}K_q}{T^{m_q/2}}\Delta^{(T)}\Big(\sum_{s\in P_q}\lambda_{j_s}\Big)+O\Big(\frac{1}{T^{m_q/2}}\Big)\Big]$$

for some constants $K_1,\dots,K_Q$ independent of T. Due to the functions $\Delta^{(T)}$, there are Q constraints if $Q<k$ or if $Q=k$ and there exists h_{i_1} and h_{i_2} such that $h_{i_1}\neq h_{i_2}$ for $i_1,i_2\in\{1,\dots,k\}$. On the other hand, if the size of the partition is equal to k and $h_{i_1}=h_{i_2}$ for all $i_1,i_2\in\{1,\dots,k\}$, there are $Q-1$ constraints. This implies that

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{T^{n/2}}\operatorname{cum}\Big(\sum_{j_1=1}^{T}D^{(l_1)}_{\omega_{j_1}}D^{(l_1')}_{-\omega_{j_1+h_1}},\dots,\sum_{j_n=1}^{T}D^{(l_k)}_{\omega_{j_k}}D^{(l_k')}_{-\omega_{j_k+h_k}}\Big)\\ =O(T^{-n/2}T^{n-(Q-1)}T^{-2n/2}T^{Q})\\ =O(T^{-n/2+1}).\end{aligned}$$

The cumulants of order $k\geqslant 3$ will therefore tend to 0 as $T\to\infty$.

(3) Proof under local stationarity. Write (S3.3) in terms of the Fourier coefficients as

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{T^{n/2}}\sum_{j_1,\dots,j_k=1}^{T}\sum_{i.p.}\prod_{q=1}^{Q}\operatorname{cum}\big(D^{(v_s)}_{\lambda_{k_s}}:s\in P_q\big)\\ =\frac{1}{T^{n/2}}\sum_{j_1,\dots,j_k=1}^{T}\sum_{i.p.}\prod_{q=1}^{Q}\Big[\frac{(2\pi)^{m_q/2-1}}{T^{m_q/2-1}}\big(\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{(v_s)}_{\sum_s j_s;\lambda_{j_s}}:s\in P_q\big)+O\Big(\frac{1}{T^{m_q/2}}\Big)\Big].\end{aligned}$$

Note that, by Corollary A.1 and the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality,

$$\sum_{j=1}^{T}\big|\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{(v_s)}_{\sum_s j_s;\lambda_{j_s}}\big|\leqslant\sup_{\omega}\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}}\|\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{j;\omega}\|_2\prod_{i=1}^{m_q}\|\psi_{v_{qi}}\|_2<\infty,\qquad s\in P_q,$$

for all $q=1,\dots,Q$. If $Q<k$ or if $Q=k$ and there are h_{i_1} and h_{i_2} such that $h_{i_1}\neq h_{i_2}$ for $i_1,i_2\in\{1,\dots,k\}$ within the same set, then there is dependence on Q of the k sums $j_1,\dots,j_n$. On the other hand, if the size of the partition is equal to k and $h_{i_1}=h_{i_2}$ for all $i_1,i_2=1,\dots,k$, then there are $Q-1$ constraints on $j_1,\dots,j_n$. Thus, similar to the stationary case, it follows that the order is

$$O(T^{-k/2}T^{k-Q+1}T^{-2k/2+Q})=O(T^{-k/2+1}),$$

hence giving the result. □

S4 Weak convergence

In this section, the asymptotic properties of the statistic $\hat{\gamma}^{(T)}$ are derived. Theorems 4.1 and 4.5 imply that for appropriate choices of the bandwidths the analysis of distributional properties may be restricted to $\gamma^{(T)}$ under

both hypotheses. Because the denominator of $\gamma^{(T)}$ is deterministic, the analysis may be further simplified by focusing on the properties of the numerator

$$w_h^{(T)}(\tau_1, \tau_2) = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{j=1}^{T} D_{\omega_j}^{(T)}(\tau_1) D_{-\omega_{j+h}}^{(T)}(\tau_2).$$

To demonstrate weak convergence, it is useful to apply a result from Cremers & Kadelka (1986) as it considerably simplifies the verification of the usual tightness condition often invoked in weak convergence proofs. In particular, the following lemma indicates that weak convergence of the functional process will almost directly follow from the weak convergence of the finite dimensional distributions once it is weakly tight in a certain sense.

Lemma S4.1. *Let $(T, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$ be a measure space, let $(E, |\cdot|)$ be a Banach space, and let $X = (X_n \colon n \in \mathbb{N})$ be a sequence of random elements in $L_E^p(T, \mu)$ such that*

(i) the finite–dimensional distributions of X converge weakly to those of a random element X_0 in $L_E^p(T, \mu)$;

(ii) $\limsup_{n \to \infty} \mathbb{E}[\|X_n\|_p^p] \leqslant \mathbb{E}[\|X_0\|_p^p]$.

Then, X converges weakly to X_0 in $L_E^p(T, \mu)$.

To apply the lemma in the present context, consider the sequence $(\hat{E}_r^{(T)}(\tau_1, \tau_2) \colon T \in \mathbb{N})$ of random elements in $L^2([0,1]^2, \mathbb{C})$, for $\tau, \tau' \in [0,1]$ and $h = 1, \ldots, T-1$ defined through

$$\hat{E}_h^{(T)}(\tau_1, \tau_2) = \sqrt{T}\Big(w_h^{(T)}(\tau_1, \tau_2) - \mathbb{E}\big[w_h^{(T)}(\tau_1, \tau_2)\big]\Big).$$

Let $(\psi_l \colon l \in \mathbb{N})$ be an orthonormal basis of $H_{\mathbb{C}}$ and denote the elementary tensor product by $\psi_{ll'} = \psi_l \otimes \psi_l'$. Then $(\psi_{ll'} \colon l, l' \in \mathbb{N})$ forms an orthonormal basis of $L^2([0,1]^2, \mathbb{C})$ and a basis expansion yields

$$\hat{E}_h^{(T)} = \sum_{l,l'=1}^{\infty} \langle \hat{E}_h^{(T)}, \psi_{ll'} \rangle \psi_{ll'}.$$

It can therefore be seen that the finite–dimensional distributions of the basis coefficients provide a complete characterization of the distributional properties of $\hat{E}_r^{(T)}$: Weak convergence of $(\langle \hat{E}_h^{(T)}, \psi_{ll'} \rangle \colon l, l' \in \mathbb{N})$ in the sequence space $\ell_{\mathbb{C}}^2$ will imply weak convergence of the process $(\hat{E}_r^{(T)}(\tau_1, \tau_2) \colon T \in \mathbb{N})$. Identifying the functional $\hat{E}_h^{(T)}$ with its dual $(\hat{E}_h^{(T)})^* \in L^2([0,1]^2, \mathbb{C})^*$, leads to the pairing

$$\hat{E}_h^{(T)}(\phi) = \langle \hat{E}_h^{(T)}, \phi \rangle$$

for all $\phi \in L^2([0,1]^2, \mathbb{C})^*$. The second condition of Lemma S4.1 will hence be satisfied if

$$\mathbb{E}\big[\|\hat{E}_h^{(T)}\|_2^2\big] = \sum_{l,l'=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}\big[|\hat{E}_h^{(T)}(\psi_{ll'})|^2\big] \to \sum_{l,l'=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}\big[|E_h(\psi_{ll'})|^2\big] = \mathbb{E}\big[\|E_h\|_2^2\big] \qquad (T \to \infty), \tag{S4.1}$$

with E_h denoting the limiting process. The following theorem shows that the finite–dimensional distributions converge weakly to a Gaussian process and is a restatement of the results of Section S3.

Theorem S4.1. *Under Assumption 4.1, for all $l_i, l_i' \in \mathbb{N}$, $h_i = 1, \dots, T-1$, $i = 1, \dots, k$ and $k \geqslant 3$,*

$$\operatorname{cum}\Big(\hat{E}_{h_1}^{(T)}(\psi_{l_1 l_1'}), \dots, \hat{E}_{h_k}^{(T)}(\psi_{l_k l_k'})\Big) = o(1) \qquad (T \to \infty). \tag{S4.2}$$

The higher order cumulant result of Theorem S4.1 establishes, for all $q \in \mathbb{N}$, the joint convergence of $\hat{E}_h^{(T)}(\psi_{l_1 l_1'}), \dots, \hat{E}_h^{(T)}(\psi_{l_q l_q'})$ and condition (i) of Lemma S4.1 is therefore satisfied. Weak convergence of the functional process can now be determined, distinguishing between the real and imaginary parts.

Theorem S4.2 (Weak convergence under the null). *Let $(X_t \colon t \in \mathbb{Z})$ be a stochastic process taking values in $H_{\mathbb{R}}$ satisfying Assumption 4.1 with $k = 8$ and $\ell = 2$. Then,*

$$\big(\Re\hat{E}_{h_i}^{(T)}, \Im\hat{E}_{h_i}^{(T)} \colon i = 1, \dots, k\big) \xrightarrow{D} (\mathcal{R}_{h_i}, \mathcal{I}_{h_i} \colon i = 1, \dots, k), \tag{S4.3}$$

where $\mathcal{R}_{h_1}, \mathcal{I}_{h_2}$, $h_1, h_2 \in \{1, \dots, T-1\}$, are jointly Gaussian elements in $L^2([0,1]^2, \mathbb{C})$ with means $\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{R}_{h_1}(\psi_{ll'})] = \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{I}_{h_2}(\psi_{ll'})] = 0$ and covariances

$$\begin{aligned}
&\operatorname{Cov}\big(\mathcal{R}_{h_1}(\psi_{l_1 l_1'}), \mathcal{R}_{h_2}(\psi_{l_2 l_2'})\big) && \text{(S4.4)}\\
&\quad = \operatorname{Cov}\big(\mathcal{I}_{h_1}(\psi_{l_1 l_1'}), \mathcal{I}_{h_2}(\psi_{l_2 l_2'})\big) \\
&\quad = \frac{1}{4\pi}\int_0^{2\pi} \big\langle \mathcal{F}_{\omega}(\psi_{l_2}), \psi_{l_1} \big\rangle \big\langle \mathcal{F}_{-\omega-\omega_h}(\psi_{l_2'}), \psi_{l_1} \big\rangle d\omega && \text{(S4.5)}\\
&\qquad + \frac{1}{4\pi}\int_0^{2\pi} \big\langle \mathcal{F}_{\omega}(\psi_{l_2'}), \psi_{l_1} \big\rangle \big\langle \mathcal{F}_{-\omega-\omega_h}(\psi_{l_2}), \psi_{l_1'} \big\rangle d\omega \\
&\qquad + \frac{1}{4\pi}\int_0^{2\pi}\int_0^{2\pi} \big\langle \mathcal{F}_{\omega,-\omega-\omega_h,-\omega'}(\psi_{l_2 l_2'}), \psi_{l_1 l_1'} \big\rangle d\omega d\omega'
\end{aligned}$$

for all $h_1 = h_2$ and l_1, l_1', l_2, l_2', and 0 otherwise. In addition,

$$\operatorname{Cov}(\mathcal{R}_{h_1}(\psi_{l_1 l_1'}), \mathcal{I}_{h_2}(\psi_{l_2 l_2'})) = 0$$

uniformly in h_1, h_2 and l_1, l_1', l_2, l_2'.

Proof. The covariance structure follows from Theorem 4.2 and the convergence of the finite–dimensional distributions from Theorem S4.1. It then remains to verify that the condition (ii) of Lemma S4.1 is satisfied. This follows from Theorem 4.2, since

$$\mathbb{E}\big[\|\hat{E}_h^{(T)}\|_2^2\big] = \int_{[0,1]^2} \operatorname{Var}\big(\hat{E}_h^{(T)}(\tau, \tau')\big) d\tau d\tau' = T\|\operatorname{Var}(w_h^{(T)})\|_2^2 = 2\|\operatorname{Var}(\mathcal{R}_h)\|_2^2.$$

This completes the proof. □

Under the alternative, a similar result is obtained.

Theorem S4.3 (Weak convergence under the alternative). *Let $(X_t\colon t \in \mathbb{Z})$ be a stochastic process taking values in $H_{\mathbb{R}}$ satisfying Assumption 4.3 with $k = 8$ and $\ell = 2$. Then,*

$$\big(\Re\hat{E}_{h_i}^{(T)}, \Im\hat{E}_{h_i}^{(T)}\colon i = 1,\dots,k\big) \xrightarrow{d} (\mathcal{R}_{h_i}, \mathcal{I}_{h_i}\colon i = 1,\dots,k), \tag{S4.6}$$

where $\mathcal{R}_{h_1}, \mathcal{I}_{h_2}$, $h_1, h_2 \in \{1,\dots,T-1\}$, are jointly Gaussian elements in $L^2([0,1]^2, \mathbb{C})$ with means $\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{R}_{h_1}(\psi_{ll'})] = \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{I}_{h_2}(\psi_{ll'})] = 0$ and covariance structure

1. $\operatorname{Cov}(\mathcal{R}_{h_1}(\psi_{l_1 l_1'}), \mathcal{R}_{h_2}(\psi_{l_2 l_2'})) =$
$$\frac{1}{4}\big[\Upsilon_{h_1,h_2}(\psi_{l_1 l_1'\, l_2 l_2'}) + \acute{\Upsilon}_{h_1,h_2}(\psi_{l_1 l_1'\, l_2 l_2'}) + \grave{\Upsilon}_{h_1,h_2}(\psi_{l_1 l_1'\, l_2 l_2'}) + \bar{\Upsilon}_{h_1,h_2}(\psi_{l_1 l_1'\, l_2 l_2'})\big]$$
2. $\operatorname{Cov}(\mathcal{R}_{h_1}(\psi_{l_1 l_1'}), \mathcal{I}_{h_2}(\psi_{l_2 l_2'})) =$
$$\frac{1}{4\mathrm{i}}\big[\Upsilon_{h_1,h_2}(\psi_{l_1 l_1'\, l_2 l_2'}) - \acute{\Upsilon}_{h_1,h_2}(\psi_{l_1 l_1'\, l_2 l_2'}) + \grave{\Upsilon}_{h_1,h_2}(\psi_{l_1 l_1'\, l_2 l_2'}) - \bar{\Upsilon}_{h_1,h_2}(\psi_{l_1 l_1'\, l_2 l_2'})\big]$$
3. $\operatorname{Cov}(\mathcal{I}_{h_1}(\psi_{l_1 l_1'}), \mathcal{I}_{h_2}(\psi_{l_2 l_2'})) =$
$$\frac{1}{4}\big[\Upsilon_{h_1,h_2}(\psi_{l_1 l_1'\, l_2 l_2'}) - \acute{\Upsilon}_{h_1,h_2}(\psi_{l_1 l_1'\, l_2 l_2'}) - \grave{\Upsilon}_{h_1,h_2}(\psi_{l_1 l_1'\, l_2 l_2'}) + \bar{\Upsilon}_{h_1,h_2}(\psi_{l_1 l_1'\, l_2 l_2'})\big]$$

for all h_1, h_2 and l_1, l_1', l_2, l_2', and where Υ_{h_1,h_2}, $\acute{\Upsilon}_{h_1,h_2}$, $\grave{\Upsilon}_{h_1,h_2}$ and $\bar{\Upsilon}_{h_1,h_2}$ are given in (S5.5)–(S5.7)*.*

Proof. The covariance structure follows along the lines of Theorem 4.6 and the convergence of the finite–dimensional distributions from Theorem S4.1. Condition (ii) of Lemma S4.1 is satisfied by Theorem 4.6 since

$$\mathbb{E}\big[\|\hat{E}_h^{(T)}\|_2^2\big] = \int_{[0,1]^2} \operatorname{Var}\big(\hat{E}_h^{(T)}(\tau,\tau')\big)d\tau d\tau' = T\|\operatorname{Var}(w_h^{(T)})\|_2^2 = \|\operatorname{Var}(\mathcal{R}_h)\|_2^2 + \|\operatorname{Var}(\mathcal{I}_h)\|_2^2,$$

which completes the proof. □

S5 Proofs under the alternative hypothesis of local stationarity

Completion of the proof of Theorem 4.6. To find the expressions for the covariance structure of $\sqrt{T}\gamma_h^{(T)}$ and its complex conjugate, use equation (B.2) and Lemma A.1 of the main paper to write

$$\begin{aligned}
&\operatorname{Cov}\big(D_{\omega_{j_1}}^{(l_1)} D_{-\omega_{j_1+h_1}}^{(l_2)}, D_{\omega_{j_2}}^{(l_3)} D_{-\omega_{j_2+h_2}}^{(l_4)}\big) \\
&\quad= \frac{2\pi}{T}\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{(l_1\, l_2, l_3\, l_4)}_{(-h_1+h_2;\omega_{j_1},-\omega_{j_1+h_1},-\omega_{j_2})} + O\bigg(\frac{1}{T^2}\bigg) \\
&\qquad+ \bigg[\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{(l_1,l_3)}_{(j_1-j_2;\omega_{j_1})} + O\bigg(\frac{1}{T}\bigg)\bigg]\bigg[\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{(l_2,l_4)}_{(-j_1-h_1+j_2+h_2;-\omega_{j_1+h_1})} + O\bigg(\frac{1}{T}\bigg)\bigg] \\
&\qquad+ \bigg[\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{(l_1,l_4)}_{(j_1+j_2+h_2;\omega_{j_1})} + O\bigg(\frac{1}{T}\bigg)\bigg]\bigg[\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{(l_2,l_3)}_{(-j_1-h_1-j_2,-\omega_{j_1+h_1})} + O\bigg(\frac{1}{T}\bigg)\bigg].
\end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\operatorname{Cov}\big(\sqrt{T}\gamma_{h_1}^{(T)}(l_1,l_2), \sqrt{T}\gamma_{h_2}^{(T)}(l_3,l_4)\big)$$

$$= \frac{1}{T}\sum_{j_1,j_2=1}^{T}\Bigg\{\frac{2\pi}{T}\frac{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{(l_1\,l_2,l_3\,l_4)}_{(-h_1+h_2;\omega_{j_1},-\omega_{j_1+h_1},-\omega_{j_2})}}{(G^{(l_1,l_1)}_{\omega_{j_1}}G^{(l_2,l_2)}_{-\omega_{j_1+h_1}}G^{(l_3,l_3)}_{-\omega_{j_2}}G^{(l_4,l_4)}_{\omega_{j_2+h_2}})^{1/2}} + \frac{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{(l_1,l_3)}_{(j_1-j_2;\omega_{j_1})}\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{(l_2,l_4)}_{(-j_1-h_1+j_2+h_2;-\omega_{j_1+h_1})}}{(G^{(l_1,l_1)}_{\omega_{j_1}}G^{(l_3,l_3)}_{-\omega_{j_2}}G^{(l_2,l_2)}_{-\omega_{j_1+h_1}}G^{(l_4,l_4)}_{\omega_{j_2+h_2}})^{1/2}}$$
$$+ \frac{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{(l_1,l_4)}_{(j_1+j_2+h_2;\omega_{j_1})}\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{(l_2,l_3)}_{(-j_1-h_1-j_2,-\omega_{j_1+h_1})}}{(G^{(l_1,l_1)}_{\omega_{j_1}}G^{(l_4,l_4)}_{\omega_{j_2+h_2}}G^{(l_2,l_2)}_{-\omega_{j_1+h_1}}G^{(l_3,l_3)}_{-\omega_{j_2}})^{1/2}}$$
$$+ O\Bigg(\frac{1}{T}\Bigg[\frac{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{(l_1,l_3)}_{(j_1-j_2;\omega_{j_1})}}{(G^{(l_1,l_1)}_{\omega_{j_1}}G^{(l_3,l_3)}_{-\omega_{j_2}})^{1/2}} + \frac{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{(l_2,l_4)}_{(-j_1-h_1+j_2+h_2;-\omega_{j_1+h_1})}}{(G^{(l_2,l_2)}_{-\omega_{j_1+h_1}}G^{(l_4,l_4)}_{\omega_{j_2+h_2}})^{1/2}}$$
$$+ \frac{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{(l_1,l_4)}_{(j_1+j_2+h_2;\omega_{j_1})}}{(G^{(l_1,l_1)}_{\omega_{j_1}}G^{(l_4,l_4)}_{\omega_{j_2+h_2}})^{1/2}} + \frac{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{(l_2,l_3)}_{(-j_1-h_1-j_2,-\omega_{j_1+h_1})}}{(G^{(l_2,l_2)}_{-\omega_{j_1+h_1}}G^{(l_3,l_3)}_{-\omega_{j_2}})^{1/2}}\Bigg] + \frac{1}{T^2}\Bigg)\Bigg\}.$$

By Corollary A.1 (ii), this equals

$$\Sigma^{(T)}_{h_1,h_2}(\boldsymbol{l}_4) = T\,\mathrm{Cov}\big(\gamma^{(T)}_{h_1}(l_1,l_2),\gamma^{(T)}_{h_2}(l_3,l_4)\big) \tag{S5.1}$$
$$= \frac{1}{T}\sum_{j_1,j_2=1}^{T}\mathcal{G}^{(l_1,l_2,l_3,l_4)}_{j_1,j_2}\Big(\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{(l_1,l_3)}_{(j_1-j_2;\omega_{j_1})}\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{(l_2,l_4)}_{(-j_1-h_1+j_2+h_2;-\omega_{j_1+h_1})}$$
$$+ \tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{(l_1,l_4)}_{(j_1+j_2+h_2;\omega_{j_1})}\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{(l_2,l_3)}_{(-j_1-h_1-j_2,-\omega_{j_1+h_1})} + \frac{2\pi}{T}\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{(l_1\,l_2,l_3\,l_4)}_{(-h_1+h_2;\omega_{j_1},-\omega_{j_1+h_1},-\omega_{j_2})}\Big)$$
$$+ O\Big(\frac{1}{T}\Big),$$

where $\mathcal{G}^{(l_1,l_2,l_3,l_4)}_{j_1,j_2} = (G^{(l_1,l_1)}_{\omega_{j_1}}G^{(l_2,l_2)}_{\omega_{j_1+h_1}}G^{(l_3,l_3)}_{\omega_{j_2}}G^{(l_4,l_4)}_{\omega_{j_2+h_2}})^{-1/2}$. Similarly,

$$\acute{\Sigma}^{(T)}_{h_1,h_2}(\boldsymbol{l}_4) = T\,\mathrm{Cov}\big(\gamma^{(T)}_{h_1}(l_1,l_2),\overline{\gamma^{(T)}_{h_2}(l_3,l_4)}\big) \tag{S5.2}$$
$$= \frac{1}{T}\sum_{j_1,j_2=1}^{T}\mathcal{G}^{(l_1,l_2,l_3,l_4)}_{j_1,j_2}\Big(\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{(l_1,l_3)}_{(j_1+j_2;\omega_{j_1})}\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{(l_2,l_4)}_{(-j_1-h_1-j_2-h_2;-\omega_{j_1+h_1})}$$
$$+ \tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{(l_1,l_4)}_{(j_1-j_2-h_2;\omega_{j_1})}\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{(l_2,l_3)}_{(-j_1-h_1+j_2;-\omega_{j_1+h_1})} + \frac{2\pi}{T}\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{(l_1\,l_2,l_3\,l_4)}_{(-h_1-h_2;\omega_{j_1},-\omega_{j_1+h_1},\omega_{j_2})}\Big)$$
$$+ O\Big(\frac{1}{T}\Big),$$

$$\bar{\Sigma}^{(T)}_{h_1,h_2}(\boldsymbol{l}_4) = T\,\mathrm{Cov}\big(\overline{\gamma^{(T)}_{h_1}(l_1,l_2)},\overline{\gamma^{(T)}_{h_2}(l_3,l_4)}\big) \tag{S5.3}$$
$$= \frac{1}{T}\sum_{j_1,j_2=1}^{T}\mathcal{G}^{(l_1,l_2,l_3,l_4)}_{j_1,j_2}\Big(\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{(l_1,l_3)}_{(-j_1+j_2;-\omega_{j_1})}\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{(l_2,l_4)}_{(j_1+h_1-j_2-h_2;\omega_{j_1+h_1})}$$
$$+ \tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{(l_1,l_4)}_{(-j_1-j_2-h_2;-\omega_{j_1})}\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{(l_2,l_3)}_{(j_1+h_1+j_2;\omega_{j_1+h_1})} + \frac{2\pi}{T}\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{(l_1\,l_2,l_3\,l_4)}_{(h_1-h_2;-\omega_{j_1},\omega_{j_1+h_1},\omega_{j_2})}\Big)$$
$$+ O\Big(\frac{1}{T}\Big),$$

and

$$\grave{\Sigma}^{(T)}_{h_1,h_2}(\boldsymbol{l}_4) = T\,\mathrm{Cov}\big(\overline{\gamma^{(T)}_{h_1}(l_1,l_2)},\gamma^{(T)}_{h_2}(l_3,l_4)\big) \tag{S5.4}$$
$$= \frac{1}{T}\sum_{j_1,j_2=1}^{T}\Big(\mathcal{G}^{(l_1,l_2,l_3,l_4)}_{j_1,j_2}\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{(l_1,l_3)}_{(-j_1-j_2;-\omega_{j_1})}\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{(l_2,l_4)}_{(j_1+h_1+j_2+h_2;\omega_{j_1+h_1})}$$

$$+ \tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{(l_1,l_4)}_{(-j_1+j_2+h_2;-\omega_{j_1})} \tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{(l_2,l_3)}_{(j_1+h_1-j_2;\omega_{j_1+h_1})} + \frac{2\pi}{T} \tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{(l_1\,l_2,l_3\,l_4)}_{(h_1+h_2;-\omega_{j_1},\omega_{j_1+h_1},-\omega_{j_2})}\Big)$$
$$+ O\Big(\frac{1}{T}\Big).$$

This completes the proof. □

Similarly, we find for the covariance structure of Theorem S4.3:

$$\Upsilon_{h_1,h_2}(\psi_{l_1 l_1'\, l_2 l_2'}) = \lim_{T\to\infty} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{j_1,j_2=1}^{T} \Big(\big\langle \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{j_1-j_2;\omega_{j_1}}(\psi_{l_2}), \psi_{l_1} \big\rangle \big\langle \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{-j_1-h_1+j_2+h_2;-\omega_{j_1+h_1}}(\psi_{l_2'}), \psi_{l_1'} \big\rangle$$
$$+ \big\langle \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{j_1+j_2+h_2;\omega_{j_1}}(\psi_{l_2'}), \psi_{l_1} \big\rangle \big\langle \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{-j_1-h_1-j_2,-\omega_{j_1+h_1}}(\psi_{l_2}), \psi_{l_1'} \big\rangle$$
$$+ \frac{2\pi}{T} \big\langle \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{(-h_1+h_2;\omega_{j_1},-\omega_{j_1+h_1},-\omega_{j_2})}(\psi_{l_2\, l_2'}), \psi_{l_1,l_1'} \big\rangle \Big), \tag{S5.5}$$

$$\acute{\Upsilon}_{h_1,h_2}(\psi_{l_1 l_1'\, l_2 l_2'}) = \lim_{T\to\infty} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{j_1,j_2=1}^{T} \Big(\big\langle \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{j_1+j_2;\omega_{j_1}}(\psi_{l_2}), \psi_{l_1} \big\rangle \big\langle \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{-j_1-h_1-j_2-h_2;-\omega_{j_1+h_1}}(\psi_{l_2'}), \psi_{l_1'} \big\rangle$$
$$+ \big\langle \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{j_1-j_2-h_2;\omega_{j_1}}(\psi_{l_2'}), \psi_{l_1} \big\rangle \big\langle \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{-j_1-h_1+j_2;-\omega_{j_1+h_1}}(\psi_{l_2}), \psi_{l_1'} \big\rangle$$
$$+ \frac{2\pi}{T} \big\langle \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{(-h_1-h_2;\omega_{j_1},-\omega_{j_1+h_1},\omega_{j_2})}(\psi_{l_2\, l_2'}), \psi_{l_1\, l_1'} \big\rangle \Big), \tag{S5.6}$$

$$\bar{\Upsilon}_{h_1,h_2}(\psi_{l_1 l_1'\, l_2 l_2'}) = \lim_{T\to\infty} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{j_1,j_2=1}^{T} \Big(\big\langle \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{-j_1+j_2;-\omega_{j_1}}(\psi_{l_2}), \psi_{l_1} \big\rangle \big\langle \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{j_1+h_1-j_2-h_2;\omega_{j_1+h_1}}(\psi_{l_2'}), \psi_{l_1'} \big\rangle$$
$$+ \big\langle \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{-j_1-j_2-h_2;-\omega_{j_1}}(\psi_{l_2'}), \psi_{l_1} \big\rangle \big\langle \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{j_1+h_1+j_2;\omega_{j_1+h_1}}(\psi_{l_2}), \psi_{l_1'} \big\rangle$$
$$+ \frac{2\pi}{T} \big\langle \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{(h_1-h_2;-\omega_{j_1},\omega_{j_1+h_1},\omega_{j_2})}(\psi_{l_2\, l_2'}), \psi_{l_1\, l_1'} \big\rangle \Big) \tag{S5.7}$$

and

$$\grave{\Upsilon}_{h_1,h_2}(\psi_{l_1 l_1'\, l_2 l_2'}) = \lim_{T\to\infty} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{j_1,j_2=1}^{T} \Big(\big\langle \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{-j_1-j_2;-\omega_{j_1}}(\psi_{l_2}), \psi_{l_1} \big\rangle \big\langle \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{j_1+h_1+j_2+h_2;\omega_{j_1+h_1}}(\psi_{l_2'}), \psi_{l_1'} \big\rangle$$
$$+ \big\langle \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{-j_1+j_2+h_2;-\omega_{j_1}}(\psi_{l_2'}), \psi_{l_1} \big\rangle \big\langle \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{j_1+h_1-j_2;\omega_{j_1+h_1}}(\psi_{l_2}), \psi_{l_1'} \big\rangle$$
$$+ \frac{2\pi}{T} \big\langle \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{(h_1+h_2;-\omega_{j_1},\omega_{j_1+h_1},-\omega_{j_2})}(\psi_{l_2\, l_2'}), \psi_{l_1\, l_1'} \big\rangle \Big) \tag{S5.8}$$

References

Aue, A. & A. van Delft (2016). Testing for stationarity of functional time series in the frequency domain. Preprint.

Cremers, H. & D. Kadelka (1986). On weak convergence of integral functions of stochastic processes with applications to processes taking paths in L_p^E. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications* **21**, 305–317.

Nelson, E. (1969). *Topics in Dynamics, Volume I: Flows.* Princeton University Press.

Panaretos, V. & S. Tavakoli (2013). Fourier analysis of stationary time series in function space. *The Annals of Statistics* **41**, 568–603.